DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 924 EA 022 408

TITLE	Hearing on H.R. 1675, Educational Excellence Act of 1989. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, One Hundred First Congress, First Session (August 2, 1989).
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	89
NOTE	133p.; Serial No. 101-48. Some small print may not reproduce adequately in paper copy.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Awards; Criteria; Elementary Secondary Education; *Excellence in Education; *Federal Legislation; Hearings; *Incentives; Recognition (Achievement); Resource Allocation; School Effectiveness; State Action
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 101st

ABSTRACT

Statements, prepared statements, letters, and supplemental material from a hearing to review the proposed Educational Excellence Act of 1989 are presented. The goal of the legislation is to promote excellence in U.S. education through recognition of and rewards to schools, teachers, and students for outstanding achievements; encouragement of the study of science, mathematics, and engineering; and provision of grants to drug-free and urban schools and to black colleges. The statement of Lauro F. Cavazos, U.S. Department of Education, is included. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EH

HEARING ON H.R. 1675, EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE ACT OF 1989

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED FIRST CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, AUGUST 2, 1989

Serial No. 101-48

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

ED325924

EA022408

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
21-341 ⇆ WASHINGTON : 1989

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
NITA M. LOWEY, New York
GLENN POSHARD, Illinois
JOLENE UNSOELD, Washington
NICK JOE RAHALL II, West Virginia
JAIME B. FUSTER, Puerto Rico
PETER J. VISCLOSKY, Indiana
JIM JONTZ, Indiana
KWEISI MFUME, Maryland

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
FRED GRANDY, Iowa
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
PETER SMITH, Vermont

Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
GEORGE MILLER, California
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
NITA M. LOWEY, New York
GLENN POSHARD, Illinois
JOLENE UNSOELD, Washington
NICK JOE RAHALL II, West Virginia

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
FRED GRANDY, Iowa
PETER SMITH, Vermont
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri

CONTENTS

Page
Hearing held in Washington, DC, August 2, 1989 1
Text of H.R. 1675 2

Statement of:

Cavazos, Hon. Lauro F., Secretary, U.S. Department of Education 44

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera:

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, prepared statement of 127
Cavazos, Hon. Lauro F., Secretary, U.S. Department of Education, prepared statement of 47
Council of Chief State School Officers, prepared statement of 120
Hawkins, Hon. Augustus F., a Representative in Congress from the State of California:
  Letter dated August 23, 1989 to Hon. Lauro F. Cavazos enclosing additional questions for the record and responses to same 88
  Memo dated July 31, 1989 re: 1990 President's Budget—No Requests for Education Funding 64
Martinez, Hon. Matthew G., a Representative in Congress from the State of California, letter dated August 2, 1989, to Hon. Lauro F. Cavazos 103
National Education Association, prepared statement of 107
Rahall, Hon. Nick J., II, a Representative in Congress from the State of West Virginia, prepared statement of 41

H.R. 1675, EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE ACT OF 1989

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 2, 1989

House of Representatives,
Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary,
and Vocational Education,
Committee on Education and Labor,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:35 a.m., in Room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Augustus F. Hawkins [Chairman] presiding.

Members present: Representatives Hawkins, Kildee, Martinez, Hayes, Sawyer, Owens, Payne, Poshard, Goodling, Fawell, Grandy, Smith, Bartlett, Gunderson, and Petri.

Staff present: Jack Jennings, counsel; June L. Harris, legislative specialist; Jo-Marie St. Martin, minority education counsel; and Beth Buehlmann, minority education coordinator.

[The text of H.R. 1675 follows:]

101ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 1675

To promote excellence in American education by recognizing and rewarding schools, teachers, and students for their outstanding achievements, enhancing parental choice, encouraging the study of science, mathematics, and engineering, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 5, 1989

Mr. Goodling (by request) (for himself, Mr. Michel, Mr. Gingrich, Mr. Petri, Mr. Gunderson, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Henry, Mr. Grandy, Mr. Ballenger, Mr. Smith of Vermont, Mr. Fawell, Mr. Grant, Mr. Hammerschmidt, Mr. Walker, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Lagomarsino, Mr. Nielson of Utah, Mr. Courter, Mr. Lewis of California, Mr. James, Mr. Shays, Mr. Broomfield, Mr. Stangeland, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Upton, Mr. Madigan, Mr. Smith of Texas, Mr. Baker, Mrs. Meyers of Kansas, Mrs. Martin of Illinois, Mr. Regula, Mr. Conte, Mr. Ravenel, Mr. Porter, Mr. McEwen, Mr. Coughlin, Mr. Boehlert, Mr. Dreier of California, Mr. Hancock, Mr. Ireland, Mr. Ritter, Mr. Bateman, Mr. Chandler, Mr. Rogers, Mr. Sundquist, Mr. Craig, Mrs. Vucanovich, Mr. Rinaldo, Mr. Wylie, Mr. Schuette, Ms. Snowe, Mr. Dornan of California, Mr. Clinger, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Burton of Indiana, Mr. McMillan of North Carolina, Mrs. Morella, Mr. Buechner, Mr. DeWine, Mr. Houghton, Mr. Thomas of California, Mr. McGrath, Mr. Pursell, Mr. Lightfoot, Mr. McCollum, Mr. Kolbe, Mr. Walsh, Mrs. Johnson of Connecticut, Mrs. Saiki, Mr. Skeen, Mr. Edwards of Oklahoma, Mr. Stump, Mr. Kasich, and Mr. Martin of New York) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

---

A BILL

To promote excellence in American education by recognizing and rewarding schools, teachers, and students for their outstanding achievements, enhancing parental choice, encouraging the study of science, mathematics, and engineering, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Educational Excellence Act of 1989".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.—This Act is organized as follows:

TITLE I—IMPROVING ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
PART A—PRESIDENTIAL MERIT SCHOOLS
PART B—MAGNET SCHOOLS OF EXCELLENCE
PART C—ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION FOR TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS
PART D—PRESIDENTIAL AWARDS FOR EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION
PART E—EFFECTIVE DATE
TITLE II—NATIONAL SCIENCE SCHOLARS
TITLE III—OTHER PROGRAMS

TITLE I—IMPROVING ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

PART A—PRESIDENTIAL MERIT SCHOOLS

PRESIDENTIAL MERIT SCHOOLS

SEC. 101. Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new part G to read as follows:

"PART G—PRESIDENTIAL MERIT SCHOOLS

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 4701. This part may be cited as the 'Presidential Merit Schools Act'.

"FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

"SEC. 4702. (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

"(1) the basic goal of all schools is to develop the skills and abilities of students to their maximum potential;

"(2) achievable standards of excellence can and should be set for all students and for all schools;

"(3) financial incentives can spur schools to rise to the challenge of meeting these standards; and

"(4) improvement in the quality of our educational system is vital to the Nation's future, and demonstrated schoolwide progress in achieving excellence deserves public recognition.

"(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this part is to recognize and reward public and private elementary and secondary schools that have made substantial progress in—

"(1) raising student educational achievement;

"(2) creating a safe and drug-free school environment; and

"(3) reducing the dropout rate.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 4703. For the purpose of carrying out this part, there are authorized to be appropriated $250,000,000 for fiscal year 1990, $350,000,000 for fiscal year 1991, $450,000,000 for fiscal year 1992, and $500,000,000 for fiscal year 1993.

"ALLOCATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 4704. (a) RESERVATIONS.—From the amount appropriated under section 4703 for any fiscal year, the Secretary may reserve—

"(1) up to one quarter of 1 per centum for grants to Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and Palau (until the effective date of the Compact of Free Association with the Government of Palau) for activities under this part; and

"(2) up to $500,000 for—

"(A) special award ceremonies; and

"(B) evaluations, studies, and reports.

"(b) ALLOCATION AMONG STATES.—(1) The amount remaining after any reservation of funds under subsection (a) shall be allocated to States as follows:

"(A) from one half of such amount, each State shall be allocated an amount that bears the same ratio to such amount as the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in the State bears to the number of such children in all such States, according to the most recent available data that are satisfactory to the Secretary; and

"(B) the other one half of such amount shall be allocated among such States on the same basis as funds are allocated among such States under section 1005 of this Act for the same fiscal year.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'State' means each of the fifty States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"STATE APPLICATIONS

"SEC. 4705. (a) FOUR-YEAR APPLICATION.—Each State that wishes to receive a grant under this part shall submit to the Secretary, through its State educational agency, an application for a four-year period, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe.

"(b) APPLICATION CONTENTS.—Each State application shall contain—

"(1) the criteria the State educational agency will use to select Presidential Merit Schools under section 4708;

"(2) the criteria it will use to determine the amount of awards;

"(3) an assurance that it will carry out this part in accordance with the requirements of this part and other applicable legal requirements; and

"(4) other information the Secretary may require.

"(c) GEPA PROVISIONS INAPPLICABLE.—Sections 435 and 436 of the General Education Provisions Act, except to the extent that such sections relate to fiscal control and fund accounting procedures, shall not apply to this part.

"STATE USE OF FUNDS

"SEC. 4706. (a) ADMINISTRATION.—Each State educational agency may use up to 5 per centum of its grant for the administrative costs of carrying out this part.

"(b) PRESIDENTIAL MERIT SCHOOL AWARDS.—Each State educational agency shall use at least 95 per centum of its grant for Presidential Merit School Awards made in accordance with section 4708.

"(c) INSULAR AREAS.—The provisions of Public Law 93-134, permitting the consolidation of grants to the Insular Areas, shall not apply to funds received by such areas under this part.

"STATE ACTIVITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

"SEC. 4707. (a) STATE REVIEW PANEL.—(1) Each State educational agency shall establish a State review panel to assist in the selection of Presidential Merit Schools.

"(2) The State review panel shall be broadly representative of the following interests in the State—

"(A) elementary and secondary school teachers and administrators;

"(B) college and university faculty and administrators;

"(C) parents;

"(D) State and local boards of education;

"(E) State and local governments;

"(F) labor;

"(G) business; and

"(H) the general public.

"(b) ANNUAL REPORTS TO THE SECRETARY.—(1) Within sixty days of making Presidential Merit School awards under this part for any fiscal year, each State educational agency shall submit a report to the Secretary that—

"(A) identifies the schools chosen as Presidential Merit Schools;

"(B) states the reasons for their selection; and

"(C) states the amount of their awards.

"(2) Beginning with the second year for which any State educational agency receives funds under this part, its annual report shall also include a brief description of how schools selected in the previous year used their awards.

"SELECTION OF PRESIDENTIAL MERIT SCHOOLS

"SEC. 4708. (a) ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS.—(1) A State educational agency may designate as a Merit School any public or private elementary or secondary school in the State that has been nominated through procedures established by such agency.

"(2) In selecting Presidential Merit Schools, each State educational agency shall apply the selection criteria uniformly to public and private schools.

"(b) CRITERIA ESTABLISHED BY SECRETARY.—(1) The Secretary shall establish minimum criteria to be used by every State educational agency in selecting Presidential Merit Schools.

"(2) The criteria established by the Secretary shall address—

"(A) progress in improving educational performance, with particular emphasis on mastery of reading, writing, and mathematics skills;

"(B) the degree to which the school demonstrates progress in achieving and maintaining a safe environment, including reduction or elimination of problems related to drug and alcohol use; and

"(C) progress in reducing the number of students who drop out of school or in encouraging those who have dropped out to reenter school and complete their schooling.

"(c) STATE CRITERIA.—(1) Based on the selection criteria established by the Secretary, as required by subsection (b), each State educational agency shall establish additional criteria that measure progress in such areas as—

"(A) student achievement, as measured by such factors as year-to-year improvement in test scores, college entrance rates, and employment of graduates in jobs with significant potential for career development; and

"(B) other indicators of a school's success, such as improvements in school leadership, the teaching and learning environment, and parental and community support and involvement.

"(2) In setting criteria for Presidential Merit Schools, the State educational agency may establish standards that recognize the composition of the student body and other relevant factors, and that give special consideration to schools with substantial numbers or proportions of children from low-income families. The State educational agency may also set different criteria for different grade levels.

"(3) In applying the criteria to a school in which a program is conducted under part A of chapter 1 of title I of this Act, the State educational agency shall consider the desired outcomes identified for children in the application submitted under section 1012(b) of this Act by the local educational agency operating the school. No school that a local educational agency has identified under section 1021(b) of this Act shall be eligible for a Presidential Merit School award.

"(4) In selecting Presidential Merit Schools and in setting the amount of their awards, the State educational agency may not consider a school's planned use of a Presidential Merit School award.

"(d) AMOUNT OF AWARD.—Each State educational agency shall establish criteria, subject to subsection (c)(4), including criteria relating to the size of the school and the economic circumstances of the student body, for determining the amount of Presidential Merit School awards.

"(e) BYPASS.—If a State educational agency is either prohibited by State law from providing funds made available under this part to private schools, or is unwilling to do so, it shall notify the Secretary of such prohibition or unwillingness, as well as the private schools it has designated as Presidential Merit Schools and the amount of their awards. The Secretary shall then provide those funds, from the State's allocation under this part, to the designated private schools, through such arrangements as the Secretary finds suitable. The Secretary shall also withhold from the State's allocation under this part the administrative costs of making such arrangements.

"PRESIDENTIAL CERTIFICATES OF MERIT

"SEC. 4709. Each Presidential Merit School shall be awarded a Presidential Certificate of Merit.

"USE OF FUNDS BY PRESIDENTIAL MERIT SCHOOLS

"SEC. 4710. A Presidential Merit School shall use its Presidential Merit School award for activities that further the educational program of the school. Such activities may include, but are not limited to—

"(1) development, implementation, or expansion of special programs, such as those focused on: dropout prevention or reentry, student transition to college or employment, preschool children, remedial services, or gifted and talented students;

"(2) the purchase or lease of computers, telecommunications equipment, scientific instruments, instructional materials, library books, and other equipment and materials, except that a public agency shall have title to, and exercise administrative control of, all such equipment and materials;

"(3) bonus payments for faculty and administrators;

"(4) college scholarships for secondary school students;

"(5) parental involvement activities;

"(6) community outreach activities; and

"(7) helping other schools replicate its success.

"PROHIBITION ON STATE OR LOCAL REDUCTION OF OTHER ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 4711. No Federal, State, or local agency may, in any year, take a Presidential Merit School award into account in determining whether to award any other assistance from Federal, State, or local resources, or in determining the amount of such assistance, to either the Presidential Merit School itself or the local educational agency, if any, that operates the school.".

PART B—MAGNET SCHOOLS OF EXCELLENCE

MAGNET SCHOOLS OF EXCELLENCE

SEC. 111. Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new part H to read as follows:

"PART H—MAGNET SCHOOLS OF EXCELLENCE

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 4801. This part may be cited as the 'Magnet Schools of Excellence Act of 1989'.

"FINDINGS

"SEC. 4802. The Congress finds that—

"(1) no single method of education, or single way of organizing schools and school systems, is best for every community or every group of students;

"(2) magnet schools have increased competition and choice and helped to improve the quality of schools and the education of children in the school districts in which they have been established;

"(3) magnet schools that focus on mathematics and science train future leaders in disciplines that are of critical importance to the Nation's economic competitiveness; and

"(4) Federal funds should be made available for the design and implementation of magnet schools, not only to further school desegregation but also to expand educational choices for students and parents and the educational benefits of such special academic and vocational school programs.

"PURPOSE

"SEC. 4803. (a) It is the purpose of this part to support the establishment, expansion, or enhancement of Magnet Schools of Excellence in order to promote open enrollment through parental choice and to strengthen the knowledge of elementary and secondary school students in academic and vocational subjects.

"(b) As used in this part, the term 'Magnet School of Excellence' means a public elementary or secondary school that—

"(1) offers the highest quality instruction in an academic or vocational discipline or creates a unique and effective learning environment;

"(2) is open to students from beyond the immediate school attendance area; and

"(3) is capable of attracting students from a variety of backgrounds.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 4804. For the purpose of carrying out this part, there are authorized to be appropriated $100,000,000 for fiscal year 1990 and each of the three succeeding fiscal years.

"GRANT APPLICATIONS

"SEC. 4805. (a)(1) Any local educational agency, intermediate educational agency, or consortia of such agencies desiring to receive a grant under this part shall submit an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information, as the Secretary may require.

"(2) An applicant may be, but is not required to be, adopting or implementing a desegregation plan.

"(b) Each application shall contain—

"(1) a description of—

"(A) the objectives of the proposed project and how those objectives will achieve the purpose of this part, as set out in section 4803; and

"(B) how the funds made available to the applicant will be used to provide an educational program of the highest quality that will encourage greater parental decisionmaking and involvement; and

"(2) such assurances as the Secretary may reasonably require.

"(c) The Secretary shall encourage applications for proposed projects that—

"(1) recognize the potential of children who are educationally disadvantaged or who come from low-income families; and

"(2) establish, expand, or enhance magnet schools that focus on a particular educational approach or on a particular subject area, such as mathematics and science.

"(d) Each application submitted pursuant to this section shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary that any proposed project assisted with funds under this part will not result in segregation based upon race, religion, color, national origin, sex, or handicap, or impede the progress of desegregation within the applicant's school system.

"SELECTION OF APPLICATIONS

"SEC. 4806. In awarding grants under this part, the Secretary shall consider the quality of the proposed project, the likelihood of the project's successful implementation, and the likelihood of its strengthening the educational program of the applicant.

"LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 4807. (a) No Magnet School of Excellence may be supported with funds under this part for more than two years.

"(b) No applicant may receive a grant for more than one year under this part, unless it demonstrates to the Secretary that the Magnet School of Excellence for which assistance was provided in the first year is making satisfactory progress in meeting the objectives specified in its approved application.

"(c) No Federal, State, or local agency may, in any year, take a Magnet School of Excellence award into account in determining whether to award an other assistance from Federal, State, or local resources, or in determining the amount of such assistance, to either a Magnet School of Excellence itself or to the local educational agency or intermediate educational agency that operates the school.".

PART C—ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION FOR TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION FOR TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS PROGRAM

SEC. 121. Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new part I to read as follows:

"PART I—ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION FOR TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 4901. This part may be cited as the 'Alternative Certification of Teachers and Principals Assistance Act of 1989'.

"FINDINGS

"SEC. 4902. The Congress finds that—

"(1) effective elementary and secondary schools require competent teachers and strong leadership;

"(2) school systems would benefit greatly by recruitment pools of well-qualified individuals, such as scientists and engineers, from which to select teachers and principals;

"(3) talented professionals who have demonstrated a high level of subject area competence or management and leadership qualities outside the education profession wish to pursue second careers in education, but often do not meet traditional certification requirements; and

"(4) alternative certification requirements that do not exclude such individuals from teaching or school administration solely because they do not meet current certification requirements would allow school systems to take advantage of these professionals and improve the supply of well-qualified teachers and principals.

"PURPOSE

"SEC. 4903. (a) It is the purpose of this part to improve the supply of well-qualified elementary and secondary school teachers and principals by encouraging and assisting States to develop and implement alternative teacher and principal certification requirements.

"(b) As used in this part, the term—

"(1) 'alternative teacher and principal certification requirements' means State or local requirements that permit entry into elementary and secondary teacher and principal positions for individuals who have demonstrated a high level of appropriate subject area competence, or management or leadership qualities, in careers in or out of the education field, but who would not otherwise meet existing requirements for teaching or supervisory positions. Alternative teacher and principal certification requirements may recognize that—

"(A) for teachers, a high level of demonstrated competence in an appropriate subject area may be substituted for traditional teacher certification requirements (such as teacher training course work); and

"(B) for principals, a high level of demonstrated competence in administration and management may be substituted for traditional principal certification requirements (such as teaching experience or supervisory experience in the field of education); and

"(2) 'State' means any of the States of the Union, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 4904. For the purpose of carrying out this part, there are authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 for fiscal year 1990.

"ALLOTMENTS

"SEC. 4905. (a)(1) From the amount appropriated to carry out this part, the Secretary shall allot to each State the lesser of either the amount the State applies for under section 4906 or an amount that is proportional to the State's share of the total population of children ages five through seventeen in all the States (based on the most recent data available that is satisfactory to the Secretary).

"(2) If a State does not apply for its allotment, or the full amount of its allotment, under the preceding paragraph, the Secretary may reallocate the excess funds to one or more other States that demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, a current need for the funds.

"(b) Notwithstanding section 412(b) of the General Education Provisions Act, funds awarded under this part shall remain available for obligation by a recipient for a period of two calendar years from the date of the grant.

"STATE APPLICATIONS

"SEC. 4906. (a) Any State desiring to receive a grant under this part shall submit an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information, as the Secretary may reasonably require.

"(b) Each State application shall—

"(1) describe the programs, projects, and activities to be undertaken; and

"(2) contain such assurances as the Secretary deems necessary, including assurances that—

"(A) funds awarded to the State will be used to supplement, and not to supplant, any State or local funds available for the development and implementation of alternative teacher and principal certification requirements;

"(B) the State has, in developing its application, consulted with the State or local agency that certifies teachers and principals, as well as representatives of elementary and secondary school teachers and principals, local school systems, parents, and other interested organizations and individuals; and

"(C) the State will submit to the Secretary, at such time as the Secretary may specify, a final report describing the activities carried out with funds awarded under this part and the results achieved.

"(c) Sections 435 and 436 of the General Education Provisions Act, except to the extent that such sections relate to fiscal control and fund accounting procedures, shall not apply to this part.

"USE OF FUNDS

"SEC. 4907. (a)(1) A State shall use funds awarded under this part to support programs, projects, or activities that develop and implement new, or expand and improve existing, alternative teacher and principal certification requirements.

"(2) A State may carry out such programs, projects, or activities directly, through contracts, or through subgrants to local educational agencies, intermediate educational agencies, institutions of higher education, or consortia of such agencies.

"(b) Programs, projects, and activities supported under this part may include, but are not limited to, the—

"(1) design, development, implementation, testing, and evaluation of alternative teacher and principal certification requirements;

"(2) establishment of administrative structures necessary to the development and implementation of alternative teacher and principal certification requirements;

"(3) training of staff, including the development of appropriate support programs, such as mentor programs, for teachers and principals entering the school system through the alternative teacher and principal certification program;

"(4) development of recruitment strategies; and

"(5) development of reciprocity agreements between or among States for the certification of teachers and principals.

"EXPIRATION DATE

"SEC. 4908. Effective October 1, 1990, the Alternative Certification of Teachers and Principals Assistance Act of 1989 is repealed.".

PART D—PRESIDENTIAL AWARDS FOR EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION

PRESIDENTIAL AWARDS FOR EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION PROGRAM

SEC. 131. (a) The heading for title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows: "CRITICAL SKILLS IMPROVEMENT AND PRESIDENTIAL TEACHER AWARDS".

(b) Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART D—PRESIDENTIAL AWARDS FOR EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION PROGRAM

"FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

"SEC. 2301. (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

"(1) the success of America's elementary and secondary schools depends most heavily upon the Nation's teachers;

"(2) when teachers are highly motivated and committed to excellence, they succeed not only in imparting subject matter knowledge, but also in instilling in their students an appreciation of the value and importance of education;

"(3) elementary and secondary school systems should have in place standards of teacher excellence and fair and effective procedures for measuring teacher success; and

"(4) in return for their efforts, excellent elementary and secondary school teachers deserve public recognition, respect, and appropriate financial awards.

"(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this subpart to reward teachers in every State who meet the highest standards of excellence.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; ALLOCATIONS TO STATES

"SEC. 2302. (a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated $7,600,000 for fiscal year 1990 and each of the three succeeding fiscal years to carry out the provisions of this part.

"(b) ALLOCATION FORMULA.—(1) From the funds appropriated for any fiscal year for this part under subsection (a), the Secretary may first reserve an amount not to exceed $200,000 for expenses related to an annual award ceremony and the issuance of award certificates.

"(2) From the remaining funds, the Secretary shall allocate to each State an amount that bears the same relation to the total amount available under this paragraph as the number of full-time equivalent public elementary and secondary school teachers in such State bears to the total number of such teachers in all the States, except that no State shall be allocated an amount under this paragraph that is less than the amount necessary to fund one Presidential Award for Excellence in Education plus the State's administrative expenses as reserved in accordance with subsection (c).

"(3) In determining a State's allocation under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall use the most recent satisfactory data available to the Department.

"(c) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Each State may reserve up to 5 per centum of its allocation under subsection (b)(2) for administrative expenses, including the cost of convening the panel described in section 2304(c).

"(d) USE OF EXCESS FUNDS.—If a State has excess funds remaining after it has made the maximum number of awards possible in accordance with section 2305(a) and reserved a portion of its allocation for administrative expenses in accordance with subsection (c), the State may use the remainder of its allocation for appropriate State ceremonies or other forms of recognition for teachers in the State who do not receive a Presidential Award for Excellence in Education.

"(e) STATE DEFINED.—For the purposes of this part, the term 'State' shall include the fifty States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, and Palau (until the effective date of the Compact of Free Association with the Government of Palau).

"(f) Insular Areas.—The provisions of Public Law 93-134, permitting the consolidation of grants to the Insular Areas, shall not apply to funds allocated under this part.

"STATE APPLICATIONS

"Sec. 2303. (a) Submission of State Applications.—The Secretary is authorized to make grants to States in accordance with the provisions of this subpart. In order to receive a grant under this subpart, the Governor of each State shall submit a one-time application to the Secretary. Such application shall be filed at such time and in such manner, and shall contain such information, as the Secretary may reasonably require.

"(b) Description of State Criteria and Procedures.—The application shall contain a description of the State's criteria and procedures for selecting recipients of Presidential Awards for Excellence in Education. The State's criteria and procedures shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary.

"(c) Assurances.—The application shall contain assurances that—

"(1) Presidential Awards for Excellence in Education shall be made in accordance with the provisions of this subpart;

"(2) the State shall provide such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as the Secretary may require; and

"(3) the State shall apply the selection criteria uniformly to nominations for recipients of Presidential Awards for Excellence in Education that are received from public and private schools, teachers, associations of teachers, parents, associations of parents and teachers, businesses, business groups, or student groups, as well as those received from local educational agencies.

"SELECTION OF AWARD RECIPIENTS

"SEC. 2304. (a) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS.—Any full-time public or private elementary or secondary school teacher of academic or vocational subjects shall be eligible to receive an award under ths subpart, except that teachers of religion (other than religion as an academic discipline) shall not be eligible.

"(b) NOMINATIONS.—(1) Local educational agencies, public and private schools, teachers, parents, associations of teachers, associations of parents and teachers, businesses, business groups and student groups may nominate teachers for awards under this subpart.

"(2) The State educational agency shall notify local educational agencies, public and private schools, associations of teachers, associations of parents and teachers, business groups, and the general public of the deadlines and procedures for making nominations, and inform them of the selection criteria that will be used in selecting award recipients in a given year.

"(c) SELECTION BY STATE PANEL.—Selection of award recipients in each State shall be made from among the teachers nominated in accordance with subsection (b). Award recipients shall be selected by a panel that is chosen by the Governor in consultation with the chief State officer and is composed of members representing parents, school administrators, teachers, school board members, and the business community.

"(d) SELECTION CRITERIA.—The State panel shall select award recipients in accordance with the criteria approved by the Secretary in the State's application. The selection criteria may take into account, but are not limited to, a teacher's success in—

"(1) educating 'at-risk' students, such as educationally or economically disadvantaged, handicapped, limited English proficient, or homeless children, as well as the children of migrant agricultural workers, to their fullest potential;

"(2) educating gifted and talented students to their fullest potential;

"(3) encouraging students to enroll, and succeed, in advanced classes in subjects such as mathematics, science, and foreign languages;

"(4) teaching in schools educating large numbers of 'at-risk' students, including schools in low-income inner-city or rural areas;

"(5) introducing a new curriculum area into a school or strengthening an established curriculum;

"(6) acting as a 'master teacher' by helping new teachers make the transition into a teaching career; or

"(7) encouraging potential dropouts to remain in school or encouraging individuals who have dropped out to reenter and complete their schooling.

"AMOUNT AND USE OF AWARDS

"SEC. 2305. (a) AMOUNT OF AWARDS.—The amount of a Presidential Award for Excellence in Education shall be $5,000.

"(b) USE OF AWARDS.—An award to an individual recipient under this subpart shall be available for the recipient's use for any purpose.".

PART E—EFFECTIVE DATE

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 141. The amendments made by this title shall be effective October 1, 1989.

TITLE II—NATIONAL SCIENCE SCHOLARS

NATIONAL SCIENCE SCHOLARS PROGRAM

SEC. 201. Part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 US.C. 1001 et seq., hereinafter referred to in this title as "the Act"), is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparts 7 and 8 as subparts 8 and 9, respectively; and

(2) by inserting immediately after subpart 6 the following new subpart:

“SUBPART 7—NATIONAL SCIENCE SCHOLARS PROGRAM

“PURPOSE; APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

“SEC. 419L. (a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this subpart—

“(1) to establish a National Science Scholars Program to recognize student excellence and achievement in the physical, life, and computer sciences, mathematics, and engineering;

“(2) to assist students who have demonstrated outstanding academic achievement in continuing their education in these fields of study at sustained high levels of performance; and

“(3) to contribute to strengthening the leadership of the United States in these fields.

“(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for fiscal year 1990, $10,000,000 for fiscal year 1991, $15,000,000 for fiscal year 1992, and $20,000,000 for fiscal year 1993.

“SCHOLARSHIPS AUTHORIZED

“SEC. 419M. (a) PROGRAM AUTHORITY.—The Secretary is authorized, in accordance with the provisions of this subpart, to carry out a program of awarding scholarships to students who are selected by the President; have demonstrated excellence and achievement in the life, physical, or computer sciences, mathematics, or engineering; and who show promise of continued outstanding academic achievement in these fields of study. The Secretary may carry out this program through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements.

"(b)(1) Period of Initial Award.—A student who satisfies the requirements of section 4190(a) may receive a scholarship, for a period of one academic year, for the first year of undergraduate study at an institution of higher education.

"(2) Continuation Awards.—A student who satisfies the requirements of section 4190(b) may receive additional scholarships, each awarded for a period of one academic year, in order to complete his or her undergraduate course of study. A student may receive additional scholarships for up to three academic years of undergraduate study, except that, in the case of a student who is enrolled in an undergraduate course of study that requires attendance for five academic years, the student may receive additional scholarships for up to four academic years of undergraduate study.

"(c) Use at Any Institution Permitted.—A student awarded a scholarship under this subpart may attend any institution of higher education, as defined in section 1201(a) of the Act.

"(d) NATIONAL SCIENCE SCHOLARS.—Students awarded scholarships under this subpart shall be known as 'National Science Scholars'.

"SELECTION OF SCHOLARS

"SEC. 419N. (a) SELECTION CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall appoint a panel of experts, composed of scientists, mathematicians, engineers, and representatives of industries that utilize advanced technologies, to recommend to the Secretary specific academic achievement criteria for use in the nomination of scholars. The Secretary shall review the panel's recommendations and publish appropriate academic achievement criteria in the Federal Register.

"(b) SELECTION PROCESS.—(1) Using the criteria described in subsection (a), each State shall nominate at least four, but not more than ten, students from each congressional district within that State. The President shall select students to receive scholarships under this part in accordance with paragraph (2).

"(2)(A) After considering the students nominated under paragraph (1), the President shall select at least thirty students to receive scholarships. The President may consult a board, consisting of the President's Science Advisor, the Secretary, and the Director of the National Science Foundation, regarding the selection of students under this subparagraph.

"(B) After considering the students nominated under paragraph (1), the President shall select an additional five hundred and forty students to receive scholarships. Each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives (or in the case of the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, or American Samoa, the Delegate or Resident Commissioner) is entitled to make recommendations to the President regarding the selection of students, nominated under paragraph (1), for one scholarship.

"(c) USE OF EXCESS FUNDS.—If the funds available under this subpart for any fiscal year exceed the amounts required for initial and continuing awards under section 419M(b), the President may, after considering the students nominated under subsection (b)(1), select additional students to receive scholarships under section 419M(b)(1).

"(d) DISBURSAL OF SCHOLARSHIP PROCEEDS.—Scholarship proceeds shall be disbursed on behalf of students who receive scholarships under this subpart to the institutions of higher education at which the students are enrolled. No scholarship proceeds shall be disbursed on behalf of a student until the student is enrolled at an institution of higher education.

"ELIGIBILITY OF SCHOLARS

"SEC. 419O. (a) REQUIREMENTS FOR INITIAL AWARD.—To be eligible to receive a scholarship under section 419M(b)(1), a student shall—

"(1) be scheduled to graduate from a public or private secondary school, or to obtain the equivalent of a certificate of graduation (as recognized by the State in which the student resides), during the school year in which the award is made, or be scheduled to so graduate or obtain such equivalent within three months after the date of the award;

"(2) have been accepted for enrollment at an institution of higher education as a full-time undergraduate student (as determined by the institution); and

"(3) have declared a major in one of the life, computer, or physical sciences, mathematics, or engineering, or provided a written statement to the State of his or her intent to major in one of these fields of study, if it is the policy of the institution at which the student has been accepted for enrollment that students not declare a major until a later point in their course of study.

"(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR CONTINUATION AWARDS.—A student who has received a scholarship under section 419M(b)(1) may receive a scholarship for a subsequent academic year of undergraduate education under section 419M(b)(2) if the student—

"(1) maintains a superior level of academic achievement, as determined in accordance with the regulations of the Secretary;

"(2) continues to major in, or provides a statement to the State as described in subsection (a)(2) of his or her continuing intent to major in, one of the life, computer, or physical sciences, mathematics, or engineering; and

"(3) continues to be enrolled at an institution of higher education as a full-time undergraduate student (as determined by the institution).

"(c) WAIVER OF FULL-TIME ATTENDANCE REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may waive the full-time attendance requirements in this section in unusual circumstances.

"(d) FAILURE TO MEET ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—In the event that the student fails to meet the requirements of this section, the student's eligibility to receive further scholarships (or scholarship proceeds) under this subpart shall be determined in accordance with the regulations of the Secretary.

"SCHOLARSHIP AMOUNT

"SEC. 419P. (a) AMOUNT OF AWARD.—Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), the amount of a scholarship awarded under this subpart for any academic year shall be $10,000.

"(b) RELATION TO COST OF ATTENDANCE AND OTHER GRANTS AND SCHOLARSHIPS.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the amount of a scholarship awarded under this subpart shall be reduced by the amount that the scholarship—

"(1) exceeds the student's cost of attendance, as defined in section 472 of the Act; or

"(2) when combined with other Federal or non-Federal grant or scholarship assistance the student receives in any academic year, exceeds the student's cost of attendance, as defined in section 472 of the Act.

"(c) ADJUSTMENTS FOR INSUFFICIENT APPROPRIATIONS.—In the event that funds available in a fiscal year are insufficient to fully fund all awards under this subpart, the amount paid to each student shall be reduced proportionately.

"SUMMER EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR SCHOLARS

"SEC. 419Q. (a) PRIORITY FOR SUMMER EMPLOYMENT.—To the extent that they are otherwise qualified, students receiving scholarships under this part shall be given priority consideration for federally financed summer employment in federally funded research and development centers, that, to the maximum extent practicable, complements and reinforces the educational program of these students.

"(b) FEDERAL AGENCY COOPERATION.—Federal agencies shall cooperate fully with the Secretary and participate actively in providing appropriate summer employment opportunities for such students.".

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 202. (a) Section 401(b) of the Act is amended by striking out "subparts 1 through 8," and inserting in lieu thereof "subparts 1 through 9,".

(b) Section 481(a)(1) of the Act is amended by striking out "except subpart 6" and inserting in lieu thereof "except subparts 6 and 7".

(c) Section 483(f) of the Act is amended by striking out "subparts 4, 5, and 7" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "subparts 4, 5, and 8".

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 203. The amendments made by this title shall be effective on October 1, 1989 for academic year 1990–1991 and succeeding academic years.

TITLE III—OTHER PROGRAMS

DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS URBAN EMERGENCY GRANTS

SEC. 301. The Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1986 (20 U.S.C. 3171 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 5111(a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking out "(other than C)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(other than part C and section 5132(d))"; and

(B) at the end thereof, by adding a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(3) For the purpose of carrying out section 5132(d), there are authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1990, 1991, 1992, and 1993."; and

(2) in section 5132, by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) URBAN EMERGENCY GRANTS.—The Secretary shall use funds appropriated under section 5111(a)(3) to award a small number of one-time grants to local educational agencies that are located in urban areas that have the most severe drug problems, to assist those agencies in developing and implementing comprehensive approaches to eliminating the serious drug problems that affect schools and students within their boundaries.".

HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

SEC. 302. Section 360(a)(3) of title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended—

(1) by inserting "(A)" immediately after "(3)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph to read as follows:

"(B)(i) There are authorized to be appropriated $10,000,000 for fiscal year 1990, $20,000,000 for fiscal year 1991, $20,000,000 for fiscal year 1992, and $10,000,000 for fiscal year 1993 for awards under section 332 of the Act to historically Black colleges and universities that qualify as part B institutions.

"(ii) A part B institution that receives an award from funds appropriated for any fiscal year under clause (i) shall not be eligible to receive an award from funds appropriated for that fiscal year under subparagraph (A), but a part B institution that does not receive an award from funds appropriated for any fiscal year under clause (i) shall be eligible to receive an award from funds appropriated for that fiscal year under subparagraph (A).".

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 303. The amendments made by this title shall be effective October 1, 1989.

○

Chairman **Hawkins**. The Committee on Education and Labor is called to order.

We are pleased to have before the committee this morning, the Secretary of Education and for the purpose of introducing the Secretary, I yield to our distinguished friend, Mr. Goodling.

Mr. **Goodling**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I want to thank you for granting us this opportunity to hear the Secretary on the Educational Excellence Act of 1989. I am one of those who have endorsed and signed on to that legislation.

I do so because I am so pleased that we have leadership downtown who believes very strongly that there is a leadership role for the Federal Government in the area of education. I am also pleased to note that some money is included in appropriations for these programs and so I am happy to have the Secretary present his testimony and respond to our questions.

For those who don't know, I just introduced the Secretary upstairs to my district press who comes to Washington, DC and follows me around for a day to see what I do, even taking pictures while I was rushing to the elevator, trying to eat my breakfast on the way.

The Secretary, of course, came to Washington, DC in 1988 nominated by President Reagan. Then President Bush asked him to remain as Secretary. He is a sixth generation Texan. He has his Ph.D. from Iowa State University and as I said to him upstairs, he certainly has helped education as far as providing students, because he and Mrs. Cavazos, who is sitting behind him, are the parents of ten children.

So, we are very happy to have you with us today, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary **Cavazos**. Thank you.

Chairman **Hawkins**. Thank you. Without the formality of asking members to forego a statement at this time, the record will be available for members to put their statements in the record.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Nick J. Rahall II follows:]

Nick Rahall

HONORABLE NICK J. RAHALL, II(D-WV)
STATEMENT
HEARING ON PRESIDENT'S EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE BILL
EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE
AUGUST 2, 1989

Mr. Chairman, I will be brief.

Dr.Cavazos I have already stated for the Record that many, if not most of your recommendations to the President, and his to the Congress, for educational excellence are programs are already in law. Many were taken care of, on a modest scale due to budgetary considerations, by the Hawkins-Stafford Omnibus Education Act signed into law by President Reagan last year.

Yet I note that the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill scheduled for action today on the floor reserves funds for some of those programs proposed to be authorized in the near future, so that they can be funded in FY 1990.

In recent actions taken by this Committee in reauthorizing the Perkins Vocational Education Act, we deliberately delayed funding for one year of several new initiatives which we believe to be of critical importance to vocational education -- namely, we delayed funding for our new Business-Labor-Education Partnership Program, authorized at $20 million; and we delayed funding for urgently needed facilities and equipment for vocational education schools and programs, authorized at $100 million.

I also note, again from the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill being considered today by the House, that the Mid-Career Teacher Training Demonstration Program for Nontraditional Students (that is, for those persons who have worked in education-related fields, and are retired or at mid-career and ready for retirement, and who would be able to become classroom teachers if they were to receive training in teaching techniques and so forth). This program, enacted as part of the Higher Education Amendments of 1986, would provide planning and operations expenses not to exceed two years for one each such program to be established in the 10 Federal Regions, after which the programs would become self-financing. After programs established with federal funds are evaluated, the Secretary would disseminate information on those programs showing the highest success rate or potential for success to Institutions desiring to establish their own. It is important to note that this program does not go on forever providing federal funds for training mid-career professionals for quick entry into the classroom - but expects Institutions with teacher training programs to for such persons in the future to fund their own. It is a fiscally sound approach, I think, and ought to be carried out accordingly.

I am pleased to note, at least, that the Administration is willing to accept an amendment to its Emergency Urban Drug Abuse Prevention proposal, by including additional funding for such emergency needs in Rural areas as well. At least, I believe the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee has recommended such an amendment.

With respect to the new "Magnet Schools" proposal, I still believe this threatens the existing Magnet Schools Program which is authorized to be funded at $165 million, and has not reached that full-funding level,not even in today's Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill.

I have other concerns over these so-called "new" propposals, and believe that at this time, we should work very hard toward full funding for existing education programs, particularly those new initiatives to be found in the Hawkins-Stafford Education Act, and the recently House-passed Vocational Education Act reauthorization before we add on more new initiatives that may become a drain on available funds for education.

I am not a person who goes around predicting doom and gloom, but if we think this year's budget process was, and remains, difficult, then we have only to wait until next year. I am for funding all education programs that are aimed at improving and enhancing the lives of our children and youth, as well as adults -- but education has suffered drastic declines in the Federal support available for it over the last decade, and I repeat that I would like to see existing programs catch up a little, plus see funding available for programs already approved by this Committee, before we begin adding on programs. The President's programs are perfectly okay as far as they go, but they are not necessarily crucial because they are not new, and some Federal dollars are already flowing down to the states and localities, however slight those amounts might be, for most of the purposes outlined for funding in the President's proposal.

I regret it if this sounds very negative, Dr. Cavazos for I am not a negative person. I am, however, a realistic person who knows how difficult it is to find money for our programs this year, particularly new initiatives, and how much more difficult it is likely to be next year. I am willing to listen; I am willing to be convinced of the absolute necessity of the President's proposals. But I will need convincing if the funding for them should supersede in importance the funding of existing and newly proposed programs also intended to address critical needs of our schools.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman **Hawkins**. May I join in the welcome and allow you, Mr. Secretary, to present your views before the committee. We are delighted to have you. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE LAURO F. CAVAZOS, SECRETARY, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Secretary **Cavazos**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I have submitted a rather lengthy statement for the record and I would like to request that that be included.

Chairman **Hawkins**. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Secretary **Cavazos**. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am pleased to present today President Bush's legislative proposal in the Educational Excellence Act of 1989. With me today is Charles Kolb, Deputy Under Secretary for Budget, Planning and Evaluation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by thanking you for holding these hearings on the Educational Excellence Act. As you know, thanks to the dedicated efforts of Mr. Goodling, this subcommittee's ranking Republican, 88 Members of the House have co-sponsored this bill.

I am hopeful, Mr. Chairman, that after today's hearing, you and your colleagues will join with the department in a bipartisan effort to move this bill through the legislative process.

Last year, the 100th Congress produced the landmark Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988 and that law advances the quality of Federal elementary and secondary education programs in many significant ways.

It improves program accountability in the Chapter 1 and Drug-Free Schools programs, expands parental choice through a reauthorized magnet schools program, provides greater flexibility to school districts in implementing bilingual education programs, enhances parental involvement in programs for disadvantaged children, and stimulates educational reform and innovation.

Our proposed legislation would complement the Hawkins-Stafford legislation in several important ways. First, it is based on the principle that Federal dollars should help those most in need. Second, it would encourage schools and teachers to strive for excellence and success by recognizing and rewarding educational progress.

Third, it would encourage major restructuring of schools by extending to parents who do not now have it the opportunity to exercise choice in selecting schools for their children, and finally, it would encourage the development of flexible systems to enrich the ranks of the teaching professions.

The Presidential Merit Schools program would provide cash awards to schools on criteria related to improved student performance in basic skills, creation of a safe and drug-free school environment, and a reduction in the dropout rate. Many schools are struggling against difficult odds to create an environment for their students that is conducive to learning.

The point here is a simple one: not to reward schools that have already "made it" but to reward those that are making significant progress.

Magnet Schools of Excellence would bring the many recognized benefits of magnet schools to communities that might not qualify for the desegregation-related Magnet Schools Assistance programs recently reauthorized by the Hawkins-Stafford Amendments.

To ensure that funds are available to benefit children who are most in need, the department would encourage applications that recognize the potential of educationally disadvantaged children to benefit from magnet schools programs.

Under the program for Alternative Certification of Teachers and Principals, the department would provide assistance to States that are interested in expanding the pool of talent from which they draw teachers and principals.

This program would offer an incentive for States to design flexible certification systems to draw into education talented professionals who have demonstrated their subject matter competence or leadership qualities in fields outside of education.

Through Presidential Awards for Excellence in Education, awards of $5,000 each would be given to teachers who meet the highest standards of excellence. Our schools are blessed with many teachers who are highly motivated and committed to excellence.

These teachers succeed not only in imparting subject matter knowledge, but also in fostering in their students an appreciation of the value and the importance of education, and for this I believe they should be rewarded.

Drug-Free Schools Urban Emergency Grants would supplement programs currently supported by the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act. Urban school districts are often disproportionately affected by drug trafficking and abuse.

Urban Emergency Grants would enable these districts to undertake the kind of comprehensive plans we believe are essential if they are to eliminate the serious drug problems that affect the schools and the students within their boundaries.

For Historically Black Colleges and Universities, the President would amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide additional support for endowment matching grants. Income from the endowment funds could be used to improve academic programs as well as institutional administration.

The National Science Scholars program would provide undergraduate college scholarships of up to $10,000 a year to students who demonstrate excellence and achievement in the life, physical, or computer sciences, mathematics, or engineering.

American students are just not choosing to enter these professions in large enough numbers, and the country is in danger of suffering a serious shortfall of scientists, mathematicians, and engineers by the year 2000. I believe this program could help us avert that danger.

Mr. Chairman, in concert with the many fine programs authorized by the Hawkins-Stafford Amendments, the programs contained in the Educational Excellence Act of 1989 would greatly advance our efforts to achieve a better-educated America.

I urge this committee and the Congress to take prompt and favorable action on this legislation. I also urge you to take a look around you and to look at what is going on in many of your own states.

Michigan has seen several significant legislative proposals to improve education statewide, including choice proposals and proposals to set quality standards for schools. Detroit offers some schools of choice.

In Pennsylvania, the School Performance Incentive Program provides cash awards to demonstrate improvement in a variety of areas. Pittsburgh and Philadelphia have magnet school programs.

In New Jersey, the Provisional Teachers Program is one of the most effective alternative certification programs in the country. The State has also adopted a proposal for a principal certification system that provides an alternative route for training and licensing principals.

Finally, I am sure that you, Mr. Chairman, are very proud of California's efforts to improve education. California has been a leader in underwriting accountability in education through its annual reporting of coursetaking and performance for all of its schools.

The California Business Roundtable has come out strongly in favor of the idea of choice, stating that "choice would strengthen the public school system by introducing competition and putting pressure on weak schools to do better."

Several models of choice are being implemented in California, including schools-within-a-school and special schools with a subject matter focus. Interdistrict choice is allowed if both school districts involved agree.

I could go on, but my point here should be obvious: many of your own states are pursuing innovations in education that are making a difference, and we deeply appreciate that. The President and I want to encourage this development through these reforms: rewards, grants, research, and innovations that you will find in the Educational Excellence Act of 1989.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Kolb and I will be pleased to answer your questions.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Lauro F. Cavazos follows:]

Statement of

Lauro F. Cavazos, Secretary of Education

Before the

Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education

House Committee on Education and Labor

August 2, 1989

Secretary Cavazos is accompanied by

Charles E.M. Kolb

Deputy Under Secretary for Planning, Budget and Evaluation

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Statement of

Lauro F. Cavazos, Secretary of Education

Before the

Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education

House Committee on Education and Labor

August 2, 1989

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

I am pleased to be here today to present President Bush's legislative proposals in the Educational Excellence Act of 1989. With me today is Charles Kolb, Deputy Under Secretary for Planning, Budget and Evaluation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by thanking you for holding this hearing on the Educational Excellence Act. As you know, thanks to the dedicated efforts of Mr. Goodling, this Subcommittee's ranking Republican, 88 members of the House have co-sponsored this bill. I am hopeful, Mr. Chairman, that after today's hearing, you and your colleagues will join with the Department in a bipartisan effort to move this bill through the legislative process. Working with key Democrats and Republicans in the Senate, we have already been successful in developing legislation that the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee reported unanimously on July 20.

Unfortunately, the Senate bill would defer implementation of the major new programs until 1991, and would condition their funding on higher funding for other programs. In the House, however, we are very appreciative that the appropriations committee has provided that we may use fiscal year 1990 funds for several of our major proposed new programs, provided that authorizing legislation is enacted prior to March 1, 1990. The appropriations committee has also indicated that it will consider funding for other new programs in our bill if authorizing legislation is enacted. Under your and Mr. Goodling's leadership, I hope that the House Education and Labor Committee will seek authorization beginning in 1990, rather than 1991, and will work for enactment prior to March 1, 1990, so that these funds can begin reaching States, schools, and children during 1990.

Last year, you and your colleagues in the 100th Congress produced the landmark Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988. That law advances the quality of Federal elementary and secondary education programs in many significant ways. It improves program accountability in the Chapter 1 and Drug-Free Schools programs, expands parental choice through a reauthorized magnet schools program, provides greater flexibility to school districts in implementing bilingual education programs, enhances parental involvement in programs for disadvantaged children, and stimulates educational reform and innovation.

America needs the Educational Excellence Act to build upon the great strides we made in Hawkins-Stafford. Let me tell you why I firmly believe this to be the case. You've heard me talk about our "education deficit" in this country. The fact that we now outspend most countries in education does not, in any way, make up for the fact that when it comes to solid results, our students and our schools overall simply aren't cutting it. Despite some promising State reform efforts, this year's "State Education Performance Chart" -- popularly known as the "Wall Chart" -- indicates that our performance on the whole is stagnating. I said when the "Wall Chart" was released, and I'll repeat it to you today: the situation scares me; it should scare you too.

Many of the State and local reforms that have been implemented across this country in the wake of A Nation At Risk are exciting and positive, but much still remains to be done. These reforms must continue, must expand, must take root, and -- most important of all -- must work. That is what President Bush's agenda is all about, and that is precisely why I'm before you today urging passage of the President's Educational Excellence Act of 1989. If you look closely at the components of this bill, you'll see that, for the most part, they are intended to help stimulate and encourage education reform -- through Federal seed money, targeted awards and grants, and expanded research that we hope will produce innovative and successful strategies for reform.

Let me just take a few minutes now and explain to you briefly the details of the seven new programs in the Educational Excellence Act of 1989.

Our proposed legislation would complement the work of the 100th Congress in several important ways. First, it is based on the principle that Federal dollars should help those most in need. Second, it would encourage schools and teachers to strive for excellence and success by recognizing and rewarding educational progress. Third, it would encourage major restructuring of schools by extending to parents who do not now have it the opportunity to exercise choice in selecting schools for their children. And finally, it would encourage the development of flexible systems to enrich the ranks of the teaching profession.

President Bush and I are very proud of this legislation. The Department and the White House worked closely in shaping the bill, and we certainly appreciate the favorable reception that we have been receiving from the Congress. We want to work closely with you, Mr. Chairman, to ensure that these proposals receive serious consideration and, of course, speedy enactment.

o The Presidential Merit Schools program would provide cash awards to schools based on criteria related to improved student performance in basic skills, creation of a safe and drug-free school environment, and a reduction in the dropout rate. The legislation would authorize $250 million for fiscal year 1990, increasing to $500 million by fiscal year 1993. Funds would be allocated to States based in part on school-age population and in part on each State's share of funds from the Chapter 1 Basic Grant program. Many schools are struggling against difficult odds to create an environment for their students that is conducive to learning. I believe we should recognize and reward the efforts of those schools to improve and provide encouragement for other schools to follow their lead. I want to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that what we are talking about here is encouraging and rewarding schools that are finding ways to make progress in improving the learning environment for their students. The point here is a simple one: not to reward schools that have already "made it" but to reward those that are making significant progress in improving their schools right now.

o Magnet Schools of Excellence would bring the many recognized benefits of magnet schools to communities that might not qualify for the desegregation-related Magnet Schools Assistance program recently reauthorized by the Hawkins-Stafford Amendments. This legislation would authorize $100 million to be appropriated each year. This complementary program would have the dual purposes of promoting open enrollment through parental choice and strengthening the knowledge of elementary and secondary students in academic and vocational subjects. To ensure that funds are available to benefit children who are most in need, the Department would encourage applications that recognize the potential of educationally disadvantaged children to benefit from magnet schools programs. I'm sure that all of you have seen the stories in The Washington Post and perhaps in your local newspapers about those parents who line up for days outside local magnet schools in order to enroll their children. They do so for a reason: magnet schools work, and George Bush and I want to find ways to expand magnet schools and other examples of choice all across this country.

o Under the program for Alternative Certification of Teachers and Principals, the Department would provide assistance to States that are interested in expanding the pool of talent from which they draw teachers and principals. An authorization of $25 million, for fiscal year 1990 only, would provide one-time grants to States to support such activities as training, program development, and evaluation. This program would offer an incentive for States to design flexible certification systems to draw into education talented professionals who have demonstrated their subject matter competence or leadership qualities in fields outside education. I believe many of our country's scientists, engineers, and business men and women would make outstanding and talented educators, and I would like to see our school children benefit from their expertise.

o Through Presidential Awards for Excellence in Education, awards of $5,000 each would be given to teachers who meet the highest standards of excellence. Our schools are blessed with many teachers who are highly motivated and committed to excellence. These teachers succeed not only in imparting subject matter knowledge, but also in fostering in their students an appreciation of the value and importance of education, and for this I believe they should be rewarded. For these Presidential teacher awards, the legislation would authorize $7.6 million annually.

o Drug-Free Schools Urban Emergency Grants would supplement programs currently supported by the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act. Urban school districts are often disproportionately affected by drug trafficking and abuse. I'm sure you agree with me that the presence of drugs in our schools — and the violence that so often attends drugs — is a national tragedy. This program would authorize $25 million per year for one-time grants to urban districts experiencing the most severe drug problems. These grants would enable school districts to undertake the kind of comprehensive plans that we believe are essential if they are to eliminate the serious drug problems that affect the schools and students within their boundaries.

o For Historically Black Colleges and Universities, the President's bill would amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide additional support for endowment matching grants. Historically Black Colleges and Universities play a vital role in the American system of higher education, yet many of them are weaker financially than other institutions. Over a four-year period, the bill would authorize $60 million for grants that could be used to match private sector contributions to the schools' endowment funds. Income from the endowment funds could be used to improve academic programs as well as institutional administration.

o The National Science Scholars program would provide undergraduate college scholarships of up to $10,000 a year to students who demonstrate excellence and achievement in the life, physical, or computer sciences, mathematics, or engineering. American students are just not choosing to enter these professions in large enough numbers, and the country is in danger of suffering a serious shortfall of scientists, mathematicians, and engineers by the year 2000. I believe this program could help us avert that danger. The legislation would authorize $5 million for fiscal year 1990, increasing to $20 million by fiscal year 1993. Each year, the President would select 570 scholarship recipients after considering the recommendations of an advisory board and Members of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, in concert with the many fine programs authorized by the Hawkins-Stafford Amendments, the programs contained in the Educational Excellence Act of 1989 would greatly advance our efforts to achieve a better-educated America. I urge this committee and the Congress to take prompt and favorable action on this legislation, which would build upon many of the fine efforts underway in your own States.

In Ohio, magnet school programs are underway, and the legislature there has seen bills introduced for programs to free excellent school districts from certain State requirements and to establish tests that can be compared across districts to help improve accountability.

Illinois has a statewide math and science magnet high school. It is also studying various choice programs across the country to see what's effective.

In Kentucky, alternative certification programs for teachers are offered through the University of Louisville. Each year, the State recognizes schools of excellence and a Compensatory Education Teacher of the Year.

Michigan has seen several significant legislative proposals to improve education statewide, including choice proposals and proposals to set quality standards for schools. Detroit offers some schools of choice.

The Montana Council for the Teaching of Mathematics awards two $1,000 scholarships each year to the top high school math students, who are chosen by statewide examination.

In New Jersey, the Provisional Teacher Program is one of the most effective alternative certification programs in the country. The State has also adopted a proposal for a principal certification system that provides an alternative route for training and licensing principals.

New York has funded a variety of magnet school plans throughout the State. One highly successful example has been the program in District 4 ofEast Harlem. There are also several award programs to encourage district and teacher innovation, including the Effective Schools Consortia Network.

In Pennsylvania, the School Performance Incentive program provides cash awards to schools that demonstrate improvement in a variety of areas. Pittsburgh and Philadelphia have magnet school programs.

In Texas, the Alternative Teacher Certification program has met the demand for new teachers and, at the same time, has become a primary means of attracting quality minority professionals to the teaching field.

In Vermont, the University of Vermont's Post-Baccalaureate Teacher Certification Program provides an alternate route to certification in a variety of elementary and secondary subjects.

In Wisconsin, magnet or specialty schools are offered at the district level. Incentives to reward teachers include sabbaticals, grants, and training workshops.

The State of West Virginia offers an alternative certification program to retired professionals with degrees in arts and sciences, and provides $5,000 to each of its "Outstanding Teacher/Principal Merit Award" winners.

Finally, I'm sure that you, Mr. Chairman, are very proud of California's efforts to improve education. California has been a leader in underwriting accountability in education through its annual reporting of coursetaking and performance for all of its schools. California parents and taxpayers can assess how well the schools are performing and how they are progressing in implementing improvement.

Choice is now being proposed in California to enable parents to act on this information in making informed choices about their children's schooling. The California Business Roundtable has come out strongly in favor of the idea of choice, stating that "choice would strengthen the public school system by introducing competition and putting pressure on weak schools to do better." Several models of choice are being implemented in California, including schools-within-a-school and special schools with a subject matter focus. Interdistrict choice is allowed if both school districts involved agree.

I could go on, but my point here should be obvious: many of your own States are pursuing innovations in education that are making a difference.

Chairman **Hawkins**. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Mr. Secretary, I had an opportunity to review the proposal last night. I stayed up rather late to read through it. After our conversation by telephone, I was grasping for opportunities to reciprocate on cooperating in every way possible.

Obviously, we look forward to as much cooperation as we possibly can. However, I must confess some degree of fear that we are diverting the real movement in the field of education from the School Improvement Act which we worked on and passed last year, and that there may be some danger trends in some of the programs being advocated in H.R. 1675.

I don't think this is the time to hesitate, to carefully consider what we are doing. There are some opportunities, it seems to me, to have some cooperation on some of the programs in H.R. 1675; some are not dramatically different from what we have tried to do on this committee.

However, unfortunately, it seems to me most of those, the ones that do offer their means of cooperation, are somewhat tied in with a new idea that has been proposed and is being called parental choice.

It seems to me that "parental choice" is a very dangerous idea that has not really been scrutinized. I think that if this committee does anything at all for education, it certainly should scrutinize any proposal, not only parental choice, but all of the other ideas that seem to be offered at this time.

We have not yet really implemented the School Improvement Act that you commended. We are behind in terms of regulations. We are behind in terms of funding and we seem in many ways to be embarking on new ideas, some of which are duplicative of the very act that we passed last year.

The merit school proposal is not really new. We gave the department the opportunity to use five percent of the basic grants for innovative ideas. That is already authorized and it seems to me that that is about as far as we should go at this time until the School Improvement Act we passed last year has an opportunity to be implemented by local school districts.

Your magnet school concept is nothing new. We worked with that concept in the Senate conference committee last year. Not only did we retain the magnet school concept in the field of desegregation, but we added a new magnet school concept in a program called alternative and curriculum schools in a section of that act.

Now, you propose to add a third one. We didn't even sufficiently fund the first one. The second one is not funded, and now, you are suddenly suggesting a third one. Well, it seems to me, that is not only duplicating what we have already done, but it takes us far afield from the purpose of trying to improve the school for every child and not simply for a few.

Now, there are other smaller programs in the proposal that I think we could, with some degree of modification, agree upon. But it all adds up to the fact that we find ourselves not funding what has been proven successful, not implementing what we already have authorized and going down a dangerous road.

One of the studies that recently surfaced was: "School Choice: The New Improved Sorting Machine" which was made possible through a grant from the University of Wisconsin. That is one of your grantees. It seemed to me that they have analyzed, much better than apparently the department, the dangers that are inherent in the proposal before us.

In a two-year research study they conducted, Mr. Moore and Ms. Davenport ended up their report by saying that, "school choice has proven risks and unproven benefits, that it represents a new and more subtle form of discriminatory sorting at a time when the economic survival of our cities depends on across-the-board improvements in the educational results."

The burden of proof now clearly rests on the advocates of public school choice to show that it can lead to significant and equitable school improvement in more than a few isolated situations, that its "at risk" students can be eliminated on a widespread basis as a matter of actual practice, and not merely on paper.

I think that we really have to be cautious in that you have no model on which to base the advocacy of school choice, and yet you have planned regional conferences around the country to sell the idea of "choice" to local school districts that already have the authority to use choice or to institute choice if they wish to, and to preferably use their own money rather than trying to get Chapter 1 money to do the job.

I would certainly express, in the spirit of cooperation, that before you go out to sell the idea to others that we document the success of those few models that have been cited already and together look at what we can do to institute reform of an educational system, without embarking on an untried, unproven and certainly an undocumented idea.

I don't think the Federal Government should be in the business of selling this idea as competition in the school system. There is no comparison between the private sector selling of soap and the selling of a service to the children of America. The competition would only mean that we would pit one school against another and it is obvious that the schools that sort out and concentrate on the higher achieving students are going to succeed.

There is no doubt about that, but two-thirds of the children of America are in schools that are unsuitable at this time. Unless we reach those children, as well as the higher achievers, then we aren't going to accomplish the goal of high quality education for all of our children. I would simply caution you that the selling of choice reminds me of the medicine man selling snake oil.

I don't think we want to sell any idea in education on that basis and I know that you are sincere, you are dedicated and we appreciate the cooperative spirit, but I would certainly caution you that when you go out on these regional conferences that you are going to be met with a lot of opposition. There will be individuals out there that will certainly be there to challenge the selling of this idea which has not been approved by the Congress. It is not that you are testing Federal education policy because we haven't dealt with it and this is new. We have a long journey together and I am willing to travel with you. If you want to travel with my friend, Bill Goodling, I know that we can cooperate, but let's do it together and not unilaterally go out without Congressional scrutiny to sell choice and try to persuade others to do it.

May I simply ask one question which worries me and that is the matter of funding. Where is the money coming from? I don't know where the money is coming from, and I hope that you can clarify that point because the Appropriations Committee will have that bill on the floor this afternoon. The Appropriations Committee has suggested that if given the authority, they would make the program available to us in terms of funding, but they suggest that it is reprogramming, money which will be taken away from Chapter 1 money, and I think that you suggested to me that that was not true, but tell me just where is the money coming from?

Secretary **Cavazos**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate very much your thoughtful words and I assure you that we will work with you to resolve the issues and problems facing education in America. Certainly coming together to discuss a bill as important as this one is a good sign in itself.

If I may take a moment to touch on many of the issues that you have raised here, Mr. Chairman. I think that first of all, the President's merit schools initiative is an important idea whose time has come. We do have, as you so accurately point out, the authority to recognize merit schools through our recognition program.

The merit schools that we are talking about in this program though are a different set of merit schools. These are merit schools that have turned around their programs. Among the criteria that might be used to identify merit schools would be, those stemming the dropout problem, having a drug-free campus, increasing test scores, and discipline. A variety of standards could be established, not just to give additional recognitions to those schools that have already made it, but to recognize and reward the schools that have turned around their programs to the point where they are moving in a more positive direction.

The "Educational Excellence Act" strives to find and reward schools that have really made a difference in the lives of young people. The issue of Magnet Schools of Excellence, is certainly a vital one. Like each of the members of this subcommittee, I continue to vigorously support as strongly as I can the desegregation aspects of our magnet school program. I am committed to working with you, Mr. Chairman, to the last day to make sure that no action taken by the department has a negative impact on our desegregation efforts.

I look at the Magnet Schools of Excellence in a different way than I do the department's Magnet Schools Program that is used for desegregation purposes. For one, the President's magnet school initiative would be available to schools that have not had the opportunity to participate in the current program because their programs are unable to meet the desegregation criteria that we required. I look at the whole issue of choice, as exemplified by the President's Magnet School Initiative, as but one of the strategies that we must employ, Mr. Chairman, to start turning around education in this nation.

I think that we must put in place a variety of strategies that have been called restructuring, that would help us turn around the problems in American education.

The issue of choice, obviously, is a key component in our plan to restructure education, and I will come back in a little more detail on that. In addition, I really believe that we need to look very strongly at the issue of alternative certification of teachers as another mechanism to attract additional professionals into teaching in vitally needed areas and from minority groups.

The issue of school-based management is another strategy that needs to be explored at the local level. While this idea is not necessarily addressed in this bill, I believe that the Federal Government should provide the leadership necessary to encourage states or localities to adopt this practice. I also believe that we have to focus a lot of attention on early childhood education.

In terms of restructuring education in our country, I believe that we could look at such things as whether to change the length of the school day, the number of days students attend school, or the differences in school programs. My point is that there are a lot of issues that have already been discussed at the National level that indicate that we must change our entire system.

My concern is a fundamental one. We are all aware of many of the problems facing education in our country, but nothing has happened. The time has come to change the system itself. The President's magnet schools of excellence proposal is a good place to start.

I have spent my whole life in research. I like to think that I am still a scientist, and I am constantly researching and looking time and time again for the answers to the problems facing education.

Lowrey Associates in 1983 conducted a study nationally and they found for all types of students choice produces significant growth and achievement in cognitive and social areas. The study showed that these benefits are not attributable to the matter of school selectivity, because 85 percent of the magnet schools do not select students on the basis of past academic achievement.

In most cases, schools of choice are not academically elite. Yet, both attendance and student behavior improved in schools of choice. These schools encourage families to get more involved in the education of their children, which, I think is critical. To me, parental involvement is perhaps the single most important element in our efforts to restructure American education. Parents need to be involved more in the education of their children, and I see schools of choice as another mechanism of achieving this key result.

Magnet schools are popular. Thirteen of the fifteen urban school districts studied showed significant growth of over 50 percent in their magnet school enrollment from 1982 to 1983. Magnet schools have been responsible for tremendous improvement in attendance rates and reducing dropout levels.

One of the best known and well-documented cases involving a magnet school is the East Harlem study. Ten years ago, East Harlem developed a system of choice in its public junior high schools and middle schools. At that time, only 16 percent of its students read at or above grade level and its students ranked 32nd in math out of the 32 community districts in New York City.

Today over half of those students read at or above grade level and the district ranked 15th or 16th depending upon the test used by the community districts. Performance and competition for students created many different educational alternatives from which students could choose.

Now, let me point out a couple of other issues here. I have made the point that choice is a catalyst to restructuring schools. I want to strongly encourage schools of choice, to reach out to the at-risk student rather than to ignore those students.

Most importantly, by expanding the concept of choice to children in the early grades, I believe we would offer students a better education at the time when they are most vulnerable. Perhaps this would cut back on the loss of some of our most at-risk students in later years.

Minnesota, Washington, Colorado, California, and other states have developed choice plans specifically for dropouts. These plans are known generically as second-chance plans because it gives students that have dropped out a second chance to succeed.

If a dropout student feels that he or she would do better in a school other than the one they dropped out of, then they have that choice under this system. Let me point out a couple of other things. While dropout figures are not available at this time for East Harlem, attendance rates have gone up dramatically to 90 percent since choice was implemented. Teacher attendance rates have also drastically improved at the school.

In Chicago where dropouts rates are about 50 percent, one of the magnet schools there, Metro High School, graduates 90 percent of its students. It only has a ten percent dropout rate—this is despite the fact that 91 percent of Metro students are minority and over half are from low-income families.

I really believe we should work together to develop an educational system of which we can all be proud. There are some cases that demonstrate that choice can work. There is some encouraging data, and I am optimistic about it.

I am optimistic that if we focus on the concept of choice and carefully examine the issues that are involved, we can set aside some of the problem areas and work together to develop a program that can be adapted to meet the educational needs of students across the country.

The choice conferences that we have scheduled are part of the department's efforts to inform the public about this key issue. Before each conference, Mr. Chairman, I have asked to have a meeting with as many parents as I can find so I can listen to their concerns. I will hopefully be able to incorporate some of their ideas into some of the actions we take at the department.

What I am trying to do here, sir, is open up to this nation the entire issue of restructuring education. I see choice as the cornerstone of our efforts to bring this about.

With regard to funding for the Educational Excellence Act, as I remarked to you yesterday in our conversation, what we are talking about here is additional funding, not taking money from Chapter 1.

I have gone on the record, sir, in front of your committee time and time again to state my strong commitment to Chapter 1. I agree with you that these are new programs and we must seek additional funding for them.

Funding for this bill should not come out of those programs that have demonstrated their worthiness.

Chairman **Hawkins**. Mr. Secretary, of course, that is highly speculative as to whether or not we can get the money, but it seems to me that without the money, you don't have a bill. The bill appropriates money for specific programs.

To talk in terms of what that money is going to be expended for is useless unless we can pin it down. We already have successful programs, for an example Chapter 1 is a successful program. It would seem to me that we should implement what is already in the statute. I agree with practically everything that you have said.

As I indicated, you already have the authority for these programs. The authority is in the School Improvement Amendments, and now you are suggesting some additional programs for which there is no money. That sends a false signal to the public, that somehow you have something that will solve the problems.

We might argue whether they do or not, but if we don't have the money to fund these programs it seems to me that we should concentrate on implementing the programs in the School Improvement Amendments. I agree with you on carrying the magnet school concept beyond desegregation; we have already done it. We have already done practically everything that you are proposing.

If I were the principal of a so-called "choice" school, God forbid, but if I were, you let me select the students, reject those I don't want, give me the choice of teachers, give me all the resources that you are talking about that are going to be put into a choice school, and I will show you some results. Even a dumb politician such as I am could do that, but that is not solving the problem.

You speak of the dropout problem. You didn't even request money for the dropout problem we already have enacted. Now, if we are going to do something about dropouts, we are not going to do it unless we put some money behind some of the programs that we already have enacted.

You have suggested cutting about 20 different programs, including not funding the dropout program, the follow through programs, as well as many of the other programs. You have even recommended cuts in student aid programs, and here you are proposing other programs while you yourself admit that there is no place to get the money to fund them.

This committee is ready to authorize and have authorized programs, but we still have to justify them.

Secretary **Cavazos**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to comment and follow-up for a moment on some of the issues you raised. As you are aware, we spend a lot of time focusing on the issue of dropouts and keeping youngsters in school. Like you, we are committed to working in a vigorous fashion to address this important problem.

Looking at our proposed budget, there are a number of programs administered by the department, such as Chapter 1, the President's merit schools initiative, migrant programs, the magnet schools for desegregation, and right on down the line to bilingual education and Title III, that are geared to address the problem of school dropouts.

The question about the dropout study—that was obviously a two-year study and I think that certainly we are going to continue to press in that area. I would like, if I may, to ask Mr. Kolb to comment a little about the matter of student aid.

Mr. **Kolb**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think, Mr. Hawkins, you made the point that there would be cuts in student aid. I don't believe that that is entirely accurate. The reductions that have come out in the budget are reductions that are based primarily on interest rate assumptions and would affect the amounts of money going for things like interest and special allowances.

The overall number of students who will be participating in and benefiting from our student aid programs will continue to go up, so there is no decrease in services whatsoever. On the general issue of where the money is going to come from, if I could just add an observation on that, I think, Mr. Chairman, it is fair to say that the money will come from where it always comes from and that is through the appropriations process. Of course, there is a bit of the chicken and the egg issue here, and that is normal because we need authorizing language.

We are very pleased at the positive signals that we have received from Mr. Natcher's subcommittee which, I think, points in the direction of merit schools and magnet schools, but we'd like the authorization and I think that President Bush and Secretary Cavazos have made it clear that we are not requesting that these programs be funded by offsetting other programs that are out there, that are working, that are doing a good job.

These are additional programs, and they are different. They're not duplicative of the fine programs in Hawkins-Stafford. What they really do is focus on accountability and state reform and that is new, and every single one of them, I think, would add to the state reform movement that is ongoing throughout this country.

Chairman **Hawkins**. I would ask permission to put into the record at this point a list of the programs for which the President's budget made no request for education program funding at this time, including ten programs in higher education.

If there is no objection, I submit this for the record.

[The material follows:]

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
[illegible] RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY,
AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

July 31, 1989

TO: Chairman Hawkins

FROM: Jack Jennings and June Harris

RE: 1990 President's Budget - No Requests for Education Program Funding

---

The President did not request any funding for the following programs for Fiscal Year 1990:

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY

1. Chapter 1, Rural Technical Assistance Centers
2. Impact Aid (Payments for "B" children)
3. Workplace Literacy Grants
4. English Literacy Grants
5. Women's Educational Equity Act
6. Dropout Demonstration Programs (the authorization expired in 1989, although we do have a House-passed bill extending the program for 2 years)**
7. Ellender Fellowships (Close-up Foundation)
8. Follow Through
9. Native Hawaiians
10. Vocational Rehabilitation Recreation Programs
11. Vocational Rehabilitation Model Transition Grants

POSTSECONDARY

1. Perkins Loans (to help needy undergraduate and graduate students meet their postsecondary educational costs through low-interest long-term loans.)

**We have to be careful with this one because there is no current authorization level for the school dropout program.

But see Sec. 1108 – which was authorized
+ authorizing 400 mill for FY-1990

2. State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG) (to help the States develop and expand grant and work-study assistance to students attending postsecondary educational institutions)
3. Innovative Community Projects
4. Cooperative Education (support for the planning, establishment and operation of cooperative education projects in higher education institutions).
5. Veterans Education Outreach (Grants help institutions support offices of veterans' affairs which provide outreach, recruitment, special educational services, and counseling)
6. Law School Clinical Experience (to establish or expand programs in accredited law schools that provide clinical experience in the practice of law.)
7. College Housing Loans
8. Douglas Scholarships (to encourage and enable outstanding high school graduates to pursue teaching careers at the preschool, elementary school, or secondary school level)
9. Harris Fellowships (to provide, through institutions of higher ed., a program of grants to graduate and professional students who demonstrate financial need)
10. Assistance to Guam

~~11. [illegible]~~

Chairman HAWKINS. I have exceeded my time, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Mr. Chairman, could we get a copy of that list also?

Chairman HAWKINS. I will let you have a copy. See that the list has also been given to the clerk, please. Mr. Goodling?

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Secretary, I didn't stay up as late last night, so I will try to be less painful or something of that nature.

Chairman HAWKINS. Are you saying that I am painful.

Mr. GOODLING. No, I said to Jack that you are not as sweet as you normally are. You stayed up too late last evening.

[Laughter.]

Mr. GOODLING. First of all, let me indicate that I stand shoulder to shoulder with the chairman in relationship to the School Improvement Act. This committee worked long and hard and we believe that there are a lot of important elements in that act that will help to improve education.

On the other hand, I look to what you have presented for the administration as something to complement what we have done and look forward to folding it all into one package. As for magnet schools, probably more than anyone else, I was the one, the fly in the ointment in our conference with the Senate last year because my fear was that they hadn't really given careful thought to what they were doing.

I also thought that perhaps if they hadn't given careful thought, it could be somebody's way of getting around the desegregation orders. I know the commitment of this President and I know your commitment. Anything that we might do in that area will be limited tightly enough that that cannot happen.

Parental choice. The Secretary and I had a lengthy meeting on parental choice because like the chairman I wanted to make sure that I understood exactly what you had in mind. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that if parental choice works as well in Harlem as Mr. Klink says it does, I promised them that you and I would spend four days and four nights there carefully looking at that program. If it has done everything in Harlem that they seem to say it has done, then they might be able to make a convert of me because if it has done all those things, that is exactly what I want to do.

They gave me a list of Harlem, Richmond, California, and Minnesota. Minnesota isn't along far enough for me to say that it did anything great, but I certainly will be happy to look at the situation in Harlem.

I want to move as rapidly as we can into alternative certification, primarily because I have said here many times, with the increased birthrate and all the post World War II teachers retiring, we are going to have difficulty attracting the brightest and best into the teaching profession.

As for merit schools, I must say that I like your proposal—you mentioned our state—I like your proposal better than our state because in our state, the one drawback that I see is that they have pitted the wealthiest against the poorest.

The former secretary of education in Pennsylvania, came out with a test that was to tell how well the schools were functioning. Only one problem, of course—they decided that Upper St. Clair was number one and I wrote him a letter and said, "My God, if they're not, most of the parents are Ph.Ds. It is the wealthiest school district, I guess, in the state. They have everything going for them. They sure should be number one."

In your program, I think you have done it the proper way where you compare similar types of schools with each other rather than saying that you are going to compare this wealthy school district with this poor school district.

So, I think that is a step in the right direction. Anything you can do in the reward area that will somehow or other help attract the brightest and best to the teaching profession, I want to be four square behind you. That's why I was so adamantly opposed to using $25 million for a national teacher certification board.

It may be fine and great for the private sector to be doing those kinds of things, but please don't take $25 million from us to do that when we are trying to find some way to attract the brightest and best into the profession, not reward them after they are there.

I want to get them there in the first place. I don't know why all these education associations jumped on that idea. I think that Kean and Hunt and some others were very powerful sales persons and all of my friends out there deserted me on this issue, but I think as they now look the situation over, they are beginning to say, "Maybe we jumped on that bandwagon too rapidly."

I am like the chairman, you know, where is the money coming from. The only problem I have in relationship to the way the Appropriations Committee has acted as far as funding any of the new programs that you are talking about is not that they haven't provided considerably more money for Chapter 1; they have.

Mr. Kildee and I both serve on the Budget Committee. We work pretty hard, he being the leader since he outnumbers my side two to one, and also had a few more allies, I guess, on his side than I had, but we think we did a pretty good job in the Budget Committee and now we are pressing the Appropriations Committee to come through.

We need to establish an understanding here today. I don't want to ever hear the Chapter 1 people say that somehow money was taken from them to fund some of the President's program simply because of the way the Appropriations Committee has tied this together. We have to keep in mind what they are saying, first of all, is that they are providing for $100 million real growth in Chapter 1. That is for Chapter 1 only. What they are saying beyond that is that enough money is there, however, beyond that $100 million growth to provide you $350 million for merit magnet schools if this committee authorizes these programs by March 1.

I think we better start right today to make this clear because I know that puts you in a terrible bind the way they have written that up. It is important to understand that they are saying $100 million real growth in Chapter 1 beyond the $350 million for some of these other programs if we authorize them. So, I wanted to make sure we are on record as pointing that out. We're partially guilty for the dropout prevention problem. Unfortunately, it didn't get authorized for 1990, so you couldn't spend those funds because we never got around to taking care of it.

We have since that time on the House side with Mr. Hayes' bill and we all supported it. Now it is up to the Senate to get off a dime and make sure that it is pushed. So, again, Mr. Secretary, the School Improvement Act is foremost on our mind.

Combining all that you want to do with that, I think, is very, very important and, again, I reiterate if everything is as good in Harlem as I am told it is, you may get a convert here. It has to be carefully worded because I don't ever want to blindly go into a situation where the brightest and best are attracted away from a school setting and then have some of the colleagues on my side of the aisle unfortunately say, "Well, if what's left isn't competitive, you close the school."

That is an interesting concept. If you close the school, what do you do with the rest of the students and how do you attract teachers into that kind of situation? I want to make sure that our choice provision is carefully drawn. The only way I will become a convert is after I have this opportunity to visit some of these sites and see all these magnificent things.

As I told the Secretary yesterday, I don't want to just go there and have somebody lead me around and show me what they want to show; that is why I thought it would take us four days and four nights to snoop.

Again, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I really don't have any questions. I am anxious to do whatever we can do to improve the school situation because we have to do it or this great nation is going to fall.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Secretary, you weren't ready for a comment, were you?

Secretary CAVAZOS. Either way. Could I make just a very brief comment.

Chairman HAWKINS. I don't want to foreclose you commenting on his remarks.

Secretary CAVAZOS. I want to thank Mr. Goodling. I want to thank him for his leadership, his friendship, and his guidance. Certainly the opportunity is before us, and by working together we can bring about positive change in our Nation's educational systems.

I see our budget as a positive statement of where we are going as a department. You see the issue of leadership expressed there. You see our support of important research projects Third, you see our strong support of those students that are left out of the system or whose needs are not always adequately looked after. Those are three hallmarks of our budget.

Our efforts, as signified by the leadership provided by the President's initiatives, are consistent with the kinds of strategies that we as a nation must focus on to address the problems facing education in the United States.

Many of the problems facing our educational system cannot be solved in the short term. Therefore, I just want to go on record once again to remind you that our budget is designed to address these problems in long-term fashion.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you. Mr. Kildee?

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Welcome, Secretary Cavazos. My wife and I enjoyed breaking bread last night with you and your wife at the White House, and I enjoyed our conversation there very much.

Both from your personal and professional record, Mr. Secretary, in our conversation last night, I am convinced of your deep commitment to education and I am convinced that we share the same basic goals in that.

We may differ from time to time as to how to achieve those goals, but what I have felt about you before was corroborated last night in our long and friendly discussion at the White House.

As a matter of fact, we discussed everything from bilingual education, magnet schools, and Headstart programs, to Chapter 1. I think our conversation last night was better than most hearings I have had with cabinet officers before, and I learned a great deal from that and I appreciate it.

I submitted a couple of questions to you as to reports due to the Congress on bilingual education and I am pleased with your assurances that you will follow through on those reports.

Secretary **Cavazos**. Coming right away, Mr. Kildee.

Mr. **Kildee**. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary. In our last reauthorization of magnet schools, we set a certain level of appropriations where we would trigger magnet school funding without the desegregation component.

Where we do trigger at a certain level magnet schools without that desegregation component, approach your concerns as illustrated in H.R. 1675?

Secretary **Cavazos**. Mr. Kildee, first of all, I want to thank you for the opportunity to visit with you and with your wife and to talk about these issues. I think it is oftentimes these informal settings that allow us to have the best opportunity to address these issues in depth. Our conversation truly indicated the depth of your commitment and understanding of the challenges facing education in America. I deeply appreciate it.

Now, the issue of alternative curriculum schools is an important component of this whole discussion on magnet schools. As you so accurately point out, we have requested about $114.6 million to fund our magnet school program. If this program were to be funded at the level of $165 million, it would trigger funding for the alternative curriculum schools program.

It certainly is one possible strategy to move ahead in that direction. However, under the current program, the projects are funded in a two-year cycle. There is no more than $114.6 million needed for the current cycle.

Alternative curriculum schools have to have a minority composition of at least 65 percent before they can participate in this program. So, therefore, the desegregation aspect of this program continues to be a determining factor for schools that wish to participate.

The President's initiative expands the concept of magnet schools beyond its traditional desegregation purpose. We will continue to demand that no department program adversely effects our desegregation efforts, but what I am really talking about in this case is a different kind of program than the traditional one that we have for desegregation. I am on the record as being extremely supportive of the existing magnet school program and I wish we could just do more in that area, Mr. Kildee.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. If the administration next year would ask for $200 million of appropriation, that would loosen up about $35 million for a new element of magnet schools and the total would be about one-third the cost of a B-2 bomber, so maybe you can tell Secretary Cheney to leave some for the kids in next year's budget.

I think that is where a lot of our money is still going even though it is said that we adopted the Dukakis defense budget this year. I think there are still some areas where we could recoup some money for education.

I think what we are concerned about is reducing our commitment to desegregation, the Federal Government's commitment. I am still old-fashioned. I think that what I began to work deeply with in the late '50s and early '60s, is not completed. There is still a long way to go in desegregation.

I think that we put that trigger and you are right, it was $165 million. We put that trigger in so we would not reduce our commitment to desegregation. I would like to work with you as we prepare next year's budget to see what we can do to get that magnet school program up to the point where we can have some money for your type of program and still keep our commitment to desegregation.

As a matter of fact, I think that this thought that the Federal Government is reducing its commitment to desegregation, is the primary reason, without judging him personally, that the Senate turned down the nomination of William Lucas of Michigan yesterday as Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division.

They really have been reading some signs both in the Executive Branch and in the Judicial Branch that there is a reduction in our commitment to desegregation. This is a great worry to the Congress. I think that is why we hung on tightly and put that $165 million figure into the magnet school bills.

So, I would like to work with you. I know that you are committed to desegregation. I know you are committed to excellence in education and I think that sharing the same goals, we can work together and try to achieve both of those.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Thank you, Mr. Kildee.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Smith. I am calling on the members in the order in which they appeared today, not on the basis of seniority.

Mr. SMITH. If you are calling on me, that is clear, Mr. Chairman, and I thank you.

[Laughter.]

Chairman HAWKINS. You have justified our faith in you now.

[Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH. I want to join the people coming before me in welcoming Secretary Cavazos here and to say following up in part anyway on what I think Mr. Kildee was just saying. I really believe that when we talk about schools and we talk about children that we are talking about the front line of defense of this country in the 21st century.

As important as the technology and the conventional notion of defense is, what we do in this committee room and I think more importantly, what we encourage and assist to happen in our classrooms will have as much or more to do with the quality of life and the continued greatness of this country in our lifetimes. I am convinced in anything else that this Congress does.

I have a specific question about the package, God forbid, but I do want to have—I have a general sort of concern and that is all of my experience in education and such as it has been leads me to believe that when you find a school that is performing above average, you find a work place that is welcoming and encouraging and stimulating to the men and women who work there as professionals.

To put it more bluntly, if schools aren't a fit place for teachers to teach, they can never possibly be a fit place for children to learn. In short, regardless of the titles we give things or the aspirations that we put in our legislation, if, coupled with them is not a power shift away from government and into the classroom, with accountability not only to government but to parents and to communities, and we don't finally understand that how we do business in schools and how we encourage schools to do business is as important as the what that goes on in schools, I don't thing we are going to get the quality we want.

The fact that we now write articles and get excited about something called "school-based management," I think makes my point. If you consider the fact that that is a novelty or an innovation, school-based management or classroom management is really phenomenalist.

We have rediscovered teachers as important to children and principals as important to schools, so I hope that as we work through these different parts of your program that your department will be characterized by understanding that schools need room to breathe.

Schools, teachers, and managers and local boards need the chance to innovate, to take their risks and to do so with a fundamental accountability, not only up to the bureaucrats and the politicians and the boards above them, but out to the children and the parents in the community where they serve and that if we can understand how to make that second kind of accountability as real and as significant as the bureaucratic accountability that we have used historically, that we will have done something fundamentally important to change the working culture in schools and to have dignified and respected schools as a place to work and to spend your time.

Having said that, I am concerned in both the merit and magnet schools sections, not with the idea of putting money on excellence, but what I fear is—and I guess I am afraid it is not inadvertent; nothing in this game at this level is inadvertent when it gets written down and duplicated 50 times.

The emphasis is on, as I read it, on results and I am all for that as opposed to challenging school districts to do a better job and I am wondering if there is any way you can see through this committee's process, if we were able to broaden the notion of a merit school with an amendment that would allow school districts to propose to their state commissioners, their chiefs, a way of doing business differently that would allow them to commit to higher standards and better performance on the part of teachers for students and in return would allow them to be challenged to do that with some money from the Federal Government as opposed to simply rewarding them for achieving that.

As you know, this is a notion that is dear to my heart, but at the same time, I know of school districts in Vermont where a very small amount of money to plan and a very small amount of money to get ready would yield enormous benefits and would get you the product that you are after.

I am concerned that, as I read it, the inherent bias here is "you perform and then we will reward you," and I would feel more comfortable if we split the difference and said we are going to do some of that, but we are also going to say for some of the rest of you, you tell us how you want to do business, we will give you a little money to do that and you tell us how you want to do business and how it is going to lead to a better job for every child so there is no backing off from any civil rights or academic commitments, that, in fact, it is taking those commitments home and putting them in the ground and nurturing them to grow.

We will be with you and we are going to hold you accountable then for the standards and the structure that you come up with that you want to implement. To me, that dignifies schools and it dignifies communities and it dignifies teachers and it dignifies principals by saying to them: "You matter and what you think matters and how you operate your school, how you want to operate your school matters, and we take that so seriously that we are going to help you do it the way you think it finally ought to be done."

I would feel better if I saw a little bit of that challenge component especially in the merit schools. I would be interested if you would comment.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Thank you very much. I would like to touch on several of the very, very fine points that you have made. You and I have an opportunity to talk about many of these issues, and I look forward to continuing our discussion in these areas.

There are several mechanisms that we can put into place to improve the quality of American education. You touched on school-based management and I see that as one of the principle positions that we should push in terms of restructuring education.

That may seem like a rather obvious thing, but obviously it is not happening. In most schools, teachers are not involved enough in many key decisions. I would like to see the teachers and the parents and the principals having more to say on what goes on on a day-to-day basis and held more accountable, as you point out.

I certainly think that we should move in that direction. We are developing a proposal which I strongly support—I haven't come up with the right term yet, Mr. Smith, maybe somebody will give it to me—which I am calling academic deregulation for lack of a better term.

What our proposal strives to do is to get the Federal, state and local bureaucracy out of the way so that the few dollars that we do have will flow to where they will be most effective in helping those parents and children who need it the most. To accomplish this, we will soon send to the Congress a proposal that we will call active deregulation or flexibility for the time being.

Now, another very important idea that you raised concerns how to challenge a school system to bring about real change. Our merit schools proposal presents us with an important opportunity to challenge schools to set their own goals as to what would constitute a merit school. In concert with the department, a school could develop a proposal that might take into account, for example, the school's high minority enrollment.

Our challenge is to provide better schools for all students, minority students, everyone. What I am getting at here is that if we could fund these programs, it will help us challenge school systems to improve the quality of their programs.

The Federal Government is not in a position to just simply dictate that "one, two, three, four, you fall into line, and this is the way it is going to be." I don't support that either. Instead, I believe our role is to encourage and challenge the schools to take steps on their own to improve the quality of education they offer.

Mr. SMITH. I appreciate it. I just at the risk of sounding non-Republican, if we could have a policy of letting a 1,000 flowers bloom and understanding that the diversity of our country and the diversity of thinking that might go on in schools would, in fact, be the strongest single thing we have going for us and we need to learn not to fear it but to embrace it. Thank you.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Thank you, sir.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Owens.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Secretary, I think that the proposals that have been put forth by the President certainly are being put forth as a beginning, I assume. They are tokens, sort of bandaids that we all recognize as bandaids and some of it is very politically packaged in that certain proposals are put forth here which are already contained in the School Improvement Act.

Instead of funding the School Improvement Act, you come back with the same proposals in another package, but nevertheless, the state of education in the United States is so bad at this point that anything that is done, we certainly would applaud as going forward.

We need movement in every direction. However, we also recognize, I hope we recognize by now that even our best schools are in trouble. International assessments of education showed that our best students are behind the best students in industrialized nations or are sometimes behind the average students in certain nations like Korea, for instance, and Japan.

So, we are in trouble even with our best schools and our worst schools are collapsing completely in inner-city areas and I come from an area of New York City where we have the very best schools and some of the worst.

So, my question is, these proposals that are being put forth here by the President, how do they fit into a broader strategy? What are your plans for five years from now, for ten years from now? Do you plan to test out the magnet school program theory some more?

It has already been proven, I think, to some extent, but you are going to test it some more and then every school district in the country is going to have a few magnet schools, is that where we are going?

Do you plan to broaden the other proposals that are made here so we go beyond the token scholarship for one teacher in each congressional district? Is there some broad long-term strategy, you know, how the Defense Department comes with a weapon system.

They try to convince us that it fits into a broader strategy, so if magnet schools are one of your weapon systems, what broader strategy does that weapon system fit into and ten years from now, where is it going to take us?

I am really concerned about the fact that we also continue to deal in such trivial terms and see the kinds of money being proposed here compared to the kind of money being proposed for a space program, the money being proposed for defense.

There is just no comparison, but yet, our defense program, our space program, economy, financial apparatus, everything depends on an educated population. In order to drive all that, we are talking about peanuts. We are talking about very small amounts of money, a very small commitment.

Where is it all going? I mean, ten years from now, where will we be? Will we have a learning society if we do this? In the Nation At-Risk, we talked about building a learning society in order to deal with leadership in the 21st century. The nation that has the most educated population will be the Nation that will provide leadership and probably have a higher standard of living in the future.

So, where will these kinds of things that you are talking about here in the President's proposals take us? Where will they fit in and what is your long-term strategy?

Secretary CAVAZOS. Thank you very much, Mr. Owens. I will be glad to address that question. First of all, I agree with you a 100 percent that our schools are in trouble, even our best schools are in trouble. Time and time again I have spoken out on the need to wipe out our educational deficit.

There are approximately twenty-seven million people who can't read in this country. Some studies indicate that U.S. students come out at the bottom in terms of math and near the bottom in science when measured against the industrialized nations of the world.

I could go on and on and on about the problems that must be surmounted Yet, we have been aware of this problem for years in this nation, for our whole generation. At one time, America's elementary and secondary school system was considered the best in the world, and now, it is really in trouble.

Last year our country spent $199 billion on elementary and secondary education. All totaled, we spent $330 billion including the money allocated to higher education as well as elementary and secondary education.

From 1982 until last year, spending on education in this Nation in real dollars increased by 26 percent. My point is that we have not made progress by continuing the same old practice of throwing more money at our problems.

Now, I will go to your question, sir. What do we need to do? We need to totally change the system. The President's initiatives are designed to provide the leadership that is necessary to reform the educational establishment.

Change cannot come about through the Federal Government acting alone. I guarantee you it can only come about if all levels of government work closely together. No one should be left out of this system.

I know that I have been criticized because I have gone out and tried to develop a coalition, a consensus of people who like you and I agree that we need to work together to change the system.

Mr. **Owens**. Mr. Secretary, let me interrupt for a minute. The Federal Government's portion of that $330 billion——

Secretary **Cavazos**. Six percent.

Mr. **Owens**. Six percent? We go from eight percent eight years ago—ten years from now, you still want to get six percent or do you foresee the Federal Government making a greater investment and taking on greater leadership.

We want to do this together, but six percent versus all that other money, we are not really together in equal terms I am not saying the Federal Government should pay an equal amount, but we certainly need to invest more than six percent of our money as well as in terms of effort and making this a priority for the Federal Government. Where are we going——

Secretary **Cavazos**. At this point, in our Nation's history, I believe we should ask ourselves some serious questions about the progress that must be made in American education in the next decade. We must restructure education at the Federal, state and local levels to change the system itself so our Nation can retain its competitive position in the world.

The strategies are laid out. You see part of them here in the department's magnet schools program. You also see throughout the President's proposal, a number of strategies we need to put into place. But, with regard to your question about the percentage of Federal funding of education a decade from now, I can't answer.

My point is that it is not just simply a matter of putting more dollars back into the system. It is making the best use of the dollars you have already.

I get into all kinds of discussions with people about, well, we only have 188 days of school, for example, one of the lowest of the industrialized nations of the world.

Japan has 220 school days per year; should we go to 220? Well, maybe we should, but I say first of all, what are you doing with 188 days that you have already? Are you really utilizing them? If you are going to increase it, how are you going to use that extra time?

So, what I am getting at, Mr. Owens, is that we need to start focusing on how to change the system. We just cannot go on doing it the way that we are doing it now.

Mr. **Owens**. Just one last comment, Mr. Secretary. I thank you for comments, but I hope you will take steps to appoint an assistant secretary for the Office of Education, Research and Improvement.

Research and development will have to play a major role in wherever you are going and we see no movement in terms of that office at this point.

Chairman **Hawkins**. Mr. Bartlett?

Mr. **Bartlett**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Secretary, first I wouldn't want you to leave here under the impression that there is unanimity about the various categorical programs that Chairman Hawkins mentioned in putting into the record earlier.

From my perspective and from the perspective of a fair number of Members of Congress, as well as of this committee, the programs that President Bush requested zero funding for in the last budget, in fact, should have been zero funded because they would free up more money for other programs that go directly to students.

As I read through the list, in fact, the one thing that all of these programs have in common is that they all go to institutions and they all seem to be categorical grants and very few of them have much, if anything, to do with education, but I didn't want you to think that there was unanimity of——

Chairman HAWKINS. Would the gentlemen yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I would be happy to yield to the chairman.

Chairman HAWKINS. Would you include the dropout program as well?

Mr. BARTLETT. The dropout program—the authorization has expired, so it is very difficult to request funding for it.

Chairman HAWKINS. We still have it authorized under another section. There are two dropout programs and if you are referring only to the dropout demonstration program, there is another dropout program authorized under Section 1011 Part C. But no request was made for funding either one.

I won't argue with you, but then you conveniently leave out the things that we have already heard this morning. The dropout program a case in point. If you don't request money for it, then it seems to me that it really isn't in good taste to say that it is a wonderful program, but we are not going to put any money into it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, the chairman makes a good point that some of these programs are more worthy than others, but, in fact, as a group, they tend to be categorical grants that go to institutions as opposed to helping students or parents to improve their own education.

As a group, in fact, the money, it seems to me, are far better spent on Federal programs such as Chapter 1 such as education of the handicapped in some of the new initiatives that the Secretary has proposed and it is my hope that this Congress will authorize during this session.

I would also comment that what your testimony has done and your initiatives is to focus on empowering parents to improve the education of their own children and empowering students to be able to improve their own education and to reward results in doing so.

The programs that you suggest are programs that are still imperfect in that we are still working through the legislation, but they very much move in exactly the right direction.

I have a specific question on one segment of education that has not been discussed yet this morning and it is segment of education that is particularly close to my heart in the southwest and that is, education as it affects Hispanic students particularly where there are large concentrations of such students.

You know the statistics. Two out of four Hispanic students are below grade level by the fourth grade. One out of two, 50 percent, dropout before graduating from high school. It seems to me that those statistics as they then are reflected in shattered lives are absolutely appalling for those individuals and terrifying for us as a nation.

The La Raza—you need among other organizations, but La Raza just recently suggested to you that you propose an executive order. That executive order would, in fact, assess the exact nature of the situation, prepare a plan for improving education of Hispanic students and develop several model programs for improving that education.

I wonder if you could respond to us on your view of the nature of education of Hispanic students today and precisely whether you have such an executive order under consideration and I recommend such an order to you vigorously.

Secretary **Cavazos**. Thank you very much, Mr. Bartlett. First of all, like you, I am painfully aware of the problems that we face throughout the entire nation, not just in the southwest, in terms of the education of Hispanics.

In our own state of Texas, you accurately point out we are losing almost half of our students. Certainly, we as Hispanic Americans continue to be undereducated.

The President shares the same concerns that you and I have on this issue. I know all of us in this room hold the same view. Basically, we are wasting talent and I experienced a sense of outrage when I think about the talent and energy that is lost in the system. I recognize that this is a major problem and that we are going to have to have a well thought out plan of action to address those programs.

Now, I have reviewed the options. I am looking at a lot of different possibilities. I have certainly been working with La Raza, with LULAC, with all the organizations that are involved here.

I think we need to approach this problem on two fronts: one from a legislative standpoint, in terms of the kinds of programs we can develop to address the dropout problem as well as to promote choice and parental involvement and many of the other issues you touched upon. Second, we really need a concerted effort among Hispanic Americans to work together as a group to address the problem of students who drop out of school.

It is not just a matter of improving the quality of education that students receive. The family structure, as you so accurately point out, plays a vital role. Some of the social ills facing Hispanic Americans must also be addressed. There are a host of other strategies that we need to consider so that we can change the system in order to improve the quality of education provided to all Americans, including those with a Hispanic heritage.

As you know, we have been talking to the National Council of La Raza about an executive order. The administration is reviewing that at the present time. I can personally guarantee this committee, and you, sir, that we will do everything we can to address the issue of improving the education of Hispanics, as well as every other citizen in this nation.

Mr. **Bartlett**. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Mr. Secretary, I am glad to hear that you are reviewing positively an executive order of that type and I recommend that you do it. I think you need to put it into your own words so that it fits into the other educational programs, but I recommend strongly that you seize the opportunity for an executive order such as has been outlined by Laraza.

On the subject of open enrollment, Mr. Secretary, when the President submitted his education initiatives early this year in his State of the Union, and then you presented them to Congress, it was a major step forward.

The President in each of these initiatives whether it is merit schools or magnet schools or teacher scholarships or science scholars, in fact, moved us forward in terms of results to students, empowering parents and empowering students.

Subsequent to that, however, you proposed with President Bush an increase and a rather dramatic emphasis on parental choice or open enrollment. That open enrollment initiative was subsequent to your submission of education initiative legislation.

So, my question is, would the department be amenable to developing with Congress and with this committee as we consider your education initiatives, to developing legislation that can—Federal legislation that can positively pursue open enrollment or parental choice as a legislative initiative?

There are a number of areas and I know that you are not prepared to announce anything today, but there are a number of areas in which we at the Federal level could push the process forward and I just want to get a determination as to whether or not you would resist that because it was not in your initial package?

Secretary **Cavazos**. I think we need to work closely with everyone with an interest in this issue to try to find a solution to the problems we face. Certainly we have proposed a package that will address many of the issues you have raised, but there may well be other problems that surface that deserve our attention.

I will work in any arena to improve the education of our youngsters and I know that you will too, so we can work together on it.

Mr. **Bartlett**. So, open enrollment and parental choice legislation is on the table, so far as you are concerned?

Secretary **Cavazos**. I think those are all valid points to discuss, sir.

Mr. **Bartlett**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman **Hawkins**. We have a vote pending. I assume it is the usual one. Mr. Secretary, may I inquire as to your time and how we can conveniently accommodate you. We will be required to vote.

It was the intent probably to take a brief recess, then come back. However, you realize that is going to extend the time.

Secretary **Cavazos**. Well, there is no more important issue than being together to discuss these points, Mr. Chairman. Really, there is nothing more important than trying to present the President's views.

Chairman **Hawkins**. Will it inconvenience you too much if we take a five-minute recess and then come back?

Secretary **Cavazos**. Not at all, Mr. Chairman. I would welcome a five-minute stretch.

Chairman **Hawkins**. The committee will take a five-minute recess.

Secretary **Cavazos**. Thank you, sir.

Chairman **Hawkins**. Members, please come back as promptly as possible.

[A short recess was taken.]

Chairman **Hawkins**. The committee will come to order. The next member is Mr. Martinez—Mr. Payne; I am sorry.

Mr. **Martinez**. That was what I was going to say, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman **Hawkins**. Mr. Payne was walking in and I didn't see him.

Mr. **Payne**. Please, Mr. Martinez, and I will wait.

Chairman **Hawkins**. We will just reverse the order, then, if that is okay?

Mr. **Martinez**. All right. Thank you, Mr. Payne, except I wasn't ready either.

Chairman **Hawkins**. Let Mr. Payne go first then.

Mr. **Martinez**. Well, he just acquiesced to me, but if you want have Mr. Payne go next, I am perfectly content with that.

Chairman **Hawkins**. You two settle it between yourselves.

Mr. **Payne**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that it is a pleasure to see the Secretary again, and just add that I am very concerned about the failure of education in our urban educational centers.

As you may know, some states have taken a proactive position on education. In New Jersey, for example, the state has recently taken over a school district because of its failure to make substantive improvements in education programs

The core of the problem however, lays in the statement Mr. Owens made about the reduction from eight percent to the current six percent of the National Federal outlay for education. We cannot continue to accept a decline in education funding. However, if the party that sits in the White House continues its activities, I would presume that by 1992 education would be down to four percent.

This trend is very, very disturbing. Especially when discussing public policy, I think that if we look at failures and because, our country's education, in my opinion, is one of our greatest policy failures; not withstanding, the B-2 Bomber, of course.

Someone indicated that the B-2 Bomber could be characterized as the batmobile, and maybe that is true: it certainly doesn't fly. Essentially, we are paying for an apparatus that is totally unnecessary.

My point being that unless we implement some dramatic changes in the manner in which we educate our children, we risk the future of this Nation.

By continuing to do things the way we are doing it, immersing our youth in this failing environment, we encourage a population of undereducated adults.

Case in point: we are currently witnessing a nursing shortage, so we bring in nurses from Asia and Ireland and other places to solve the problem. However, the cost of doing this kind of business is extremely high. The extra costs of transportation and housing and special bureaucratic approvals for people to come in through our Federal services, and the cost of medical care escalates by the minute, and further bankrupts our government.

The same way with our scientists, we bring them in. Whatever we lack, we just import. It is really not a way to solve our problems. No one is thinking about resolutions. When the European common market comes into effect, there will be 300 million people acting as one block of trading partners—if we think our balance of trade is bad now, what do we expect will happen come 1992 and beyond.

One would expect that there would be more concern on the part of our authorities, but it doesn't appear to be the case. Take the Barbadans, for example for a poor country, they have a 98 percent literacy rate, that is outstanding when one considers the 27 million illiterates of our country.

It costs us about $225 billion a year, to correct the resultant mistakes and errors and lack of productivity. We have people who can't read directions on pill bottles or read bus signs to get to work.

This tremendous lack of concern is most stark when compared to Cuba. Cuba today has a 99 percent literacy rate, and America barely hits the 90 percent mark. Clearly, there has to be some changes in the system.

Just about a specific point of the National science scholarship. You have testified that undergraduate college scholarships have risen to $10 thousand a year for students who demonstrate excellence in achievement of life, physical, computer science, as math or engineering students and 570 will be selected annually.

This is great, but once again, getting back to the urban education, what kind of provisions are being made so that out of this 570, all are not kids from a suburban community. Because, as you know, based strictly on the achievement, certainly are going to find that that top group would all come from suburban districts, leaving the urban districts without the benefit of that monetary advantage.

If it is going to be based strictly on those who demonstrate excellence, is there any provision that would compensate for those who start 20 yards behind in a 100-yard dash; in other words is there any way to make the playing field more even; because as you know, it is now very uneven?

Secretary CAVAZOS. Yes, sir.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Payne, your time has exceeded the time allowed. Mr. Cavazos, we will give you the opportunity to comment.

Secretary CAVAZOS. If I may, I would like to point out that we will convene a panel of scientists, mathematicians, engineers, and other community leaders to help develop the selection criteria for this scholarship program.

I think that you raised an important issue. The department is continually striving to level the playing field for minority students in such a way that provides them with the same opportunities as other American students.

We can do it in two ways. One, by putting in place innovative strategies to make sure that minority students receive the best possible education. The only way this can be done, however, is to change the system itself.

Second, on the graduate level, the department's Patricia Roberts Harris graduate fellowships provide grants to institutions to help members of unrepresented groups undertake graduate and professional study.

What we need to do is to try to continue to develop initiatives in addition to these fellowships, including examining our Pell grant program and some of our other projects to make sure that we provide additional opportunities for those students to succeed.

Chairman **Hawkins**. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Next, Mr. Hayes.

Mr. **Hayes**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will make sure I break within the five-minute——

Chairman **Hawkins**. I am sorry, Mr. Hayes. Mr. Martinez is——

Mr. **Martinez**. Sorry, Charlie, and of course, I had to go——

Mr. **Hayes**. I respect seniority.

Mr. **Martinez**. And of course, I had to go before Charlie because I promised to intercede on your behalf. And Charlie, you know, has a tendency to really get on some people some times. I told him you want to be very careful of getting too hard with Mr. Cavazos because he is a member of a minority; he is Republican.

[Laughter.]

Mr. **Martinez**. It is really odd to hear that. They are always complaining on that side of being a minority. I think some of them understand what it is being a minority, but I don't think the majority of them really do.

The thing is that we have heard this expression, "We live in two different worlds and there are two worlds," and then we hear the expression, "Reality, what is reality?"

Well, really, we do live in different worlds and maybe several different worlds, and not just two. There are different realities: realities as we see them from the top and realities as we see them from the bottom.

I am more concerned with the reality as perceived from the bottom. For all of the rhetoric that we go through here, the bottom really hasn't changed much. The Nation At Risk study came out a long time ago and I don't think that there has been very much improvement since then. Of course, we have put programs in place that have attempted to try to make a change. And then we have had great oratorical statements from leaders, including the President and others, about the need for a particular thing while it's a great issue in the press, and while somebody else has made it an issue—notably because there is some great deficiency.

I am talking about literacy, and yet, in the President's proposal, there is no funding requested for workplace literacy or English literacy grants. This is based, I guess, on the assumption that these programs are a duplicate of state grant programs.

I suggest that they are not. I suggest that the state grant program can be used for a range of things. The state grant authority does not specifically target work place literacy or English literacy grants and the state has to make the application in their plan for that.

The problem that I have with that is that in some particular states, people have not become aware yet of the great literacy problem that we have in this country. They should stress those activities, but sometimes they don't. Or let's say, that is not the governor's greatest preference. Whatever the reasons, there won't be any funding for these literary programs and there may be a tremendous need.

You do have discretionary powers and you do have actually as part of the state grant authority, the ability to grant or not grant. I would like to know specifically why the administration doesn't see literacy as such a great problem—especially where we are finding that when we try to implement other programs—let's say, as additional worker in JTPA—that a lot of these people need basic skill development before they can even take advantage of the initial thrust of the program.

We have found in many sites, such as San Jose when I visited there, that the training that these people needed to receive, couldn't be received unless they got the basic skill training first. They developed there—and they are to be commended for it—what they call "feeder classes."

These people were dropouts, people that at some point in time people thought couldn't even learn. And for adults, it was harder to learn. I have seen it in youth programs, too, where new kinds of strategies have been developed to meet particular specific needs of a student and as a result, that student has acquired that education needed in a very short period of time.

I guess basically the question is, why would the administration take such a stand that work place literacy and English literacy does not have to be targeted?

Secretary CAVAZOS. Thank you very much, Mr. Martinez. I very much appreciate your comments about the issues and problems facing American education. We will work together to try to turn this situation around. With regard to your question about funding for adult literacy programs, I can assure you that this is a high priority of this administration.

Let me point out that there is no separate literacy initiative in President Bush's legislative proposal because in the Reagan budget request for 1990, we already had included $160 million and $665 thousand for adult education state programs. This is an 18 percent increase over fiscal year 1989 appropriation for this program.

Now, I really believe that this increase will help to further expand existing programs to address this issue. But, you made another very important point that there appears to be a lack of understanding among the citizens about the seriousness of the literacy problem in our Nation.

On the state and Federal level, we must work to address the issue of improving plain basic skills of many Americans. Far too many people don't have the skills required to succeed in today's society and we have to find ways to put pressure on states to work in that direction.

I think improving literacy in the work place is vital and we have some programs in that area. We are already working with the Department of Health and Human Services to address work place literacy.

What we are talking about here, Mr. Martinez, is that all segments of the education community must work together to turn this unfortunate situation around. We have already talked about early childhood education. We have talked about elementary and secondary education.

Though we have not spent much time talking about them today, vocational education programs for the handicapped, right on down the line to our adult literacy programs, all play an important role in our efforts to combat our illiteracy problem. In addition, Even Start, one of our other programs for which we have requested a considerable increase in funding, encourages a youngster when he or she starts in the first grade or kindergarten to begin teaching their parents how to read if they don't already know.

So, we will work with you, Mr. Martinez, to improve the programs currently in existence to address this most important problem.

Mr. **Martinez**. I thank you very much, Mr. Secretary. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to make some other sentiments known to the Secretary and I would like to write those sentiments in a letter to the Secretary and then have him respond. And I also wish to make these concerns a part of a statement in the record at this time.

Chairman **Hawkins**. The gentleman's request, without opposition, is granted.

Secretary **Cavazos**. Thank you, Mr. Martinez. We will get them right back to you.

Mr. **Martinez**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman **Hawkins**. Mr. Petri?

Mr. **Petri**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Secretary, for appearing before our subcommittee today. I had several questions about the program—one on the merit schools aspect of it.

Will private schools as well as public schools be eligible for any aspect of the merit school program?

Secretary **Cavazos**. They will be eligible to participate in the program. I think certainly private schools are an important component of the educational opportunities we have to offer in our Nation. We welcome the increased competition that will come as a result of the participation of independent schools in this program.

We have already moved in that direction with our own merit recognition programs as well.

Mr. **Kolb**. I think one point just to add, Mr. Petri, the private schools would not be able to use these funds to support religious worship or instruction. I think that the legislation makes that clear, but we would like to see all schools participate from what we think is a very, very good program.

Mr. **Petri**. One of the advantages of having a variety of approaches to education is that people can learn from each other and adopt what works. That is, I guess, the American tradition of pragmatism and so, I am sure that there are some private schools, as well as public schools, that are doing things that are meritorious.

The second question is whether you gave any thought to having a merit schools system program. It is my impression that over the last 20 or 30 years, there has been a gradual shift of cost so that more and more money is spent on overhead and less and less on actual instruction expenses.

There may be some school systems in the country that have bucked that trend and have found ways of doing the job with less overhead costs, but whose students are doing as well as or better in that system than in other systems with high overhead costs.

When we compare different large city systems, sometimes we spend more per pupil but seem not to be getting better results. The money doesn't seem to be the variable; there are some other systems with very low overhead and a high percentage of expenses going directly to teacher salaries and to facilities and yet kids are doing just as well.

So, there may be some administrative techniques or differences that could be highlighted so that the citizens and voters and school boards would be aware that there are other school systems managing to grapple with problems with lower overhead.

Do you have a comment on that, or is that included?

Secretary CAVAZOS. Yes, sir, I would like to comment on the important point you touched upon. Far too often, excessive bureaucracy tends to dilute our ability to get the dollars down to the level where they are most effective.

Some of the schools have found that way to address this problem. I was frankly appalled the other day when I learned that on a national level roughly 60 percent of the money spent on education goes for administrative purposes, with only about 40 percent actually getting down to the level it can be used by a teacher to directly affect the education of our youngsters.

We need to find ways to start changing that. In Chicago, as well as other areas, they are really trying very, very hard to improve the efficiency of their system. So, we must continue to work together to seek ways to eliminate red tape. I believe it is our responsibility to conduct research on how to accomplish this so we can give guidance to others about potential methods to reduce administrative costs.

Mr. PETRI. One other area that has always been a little bit of a bee in my bonnet is in the area of teachers devoting extracurricular time as advisors to student groups and the like. I know it has become a bargaining issue in some school systems and teachers are prevented from doing that unless they are paid. Or there are various other impediments put in the way of teachers devoting extra effort and participating as volunteers.

We talk about volunteerism and trying to get students more involved in their community on a voluntary basis, and it seems to me we ought, if we can, to find examples of teachers who are volunteering to help kids not only directly in the classroom, but also by donating extra time to help broaden young people's experiences through debate and sports and a whole variety of other ways.

I don't know if you have any comment on that.

Secretary CAVAZOS. I really believe that teachers, principals, and parents should have more to say as to what goes on on a day-to-day basis within their school—I am back again on this notion of reducing bureaucracy—and when that happens we will be in a better position to encourage and recognize the outstanding teachers about whom you speak.

We all have fond memories of teachers who gave of their time to help us learn how to read or do other extracurricular things as well. They definitely deserve our recognition and encouragement.

What I am striving to do is improve upon the professionalization of the teaching profession itself. I want everyone to know that teaching is a rewarding experience. It is an important endeavor and I think that we can do this if we change the system itself.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you. Gentlemen, we have a problem. I promised the Secretary that he could leave in time for a 12:00 appointment which is more important and yet, we have three members who have not had an opportunity to ask questions.

I hate to foreclose anyone, but could we agree to take a minute or so each and ask a question and then, perhaps, the Secretary could respond to several questions in one response. Mr. Hayes, you were next.

Mr. **Hayes**. I will abide by your request, Mr. Chairman, to try to confine my remarks to one minute. I hope the Secretary's response is not included in that one minute, though.

Chairman **Hawkins**. We are going to let him respond to the several questions together.

Mr. **Hayes**. All right, in block?

Chairman **Hawkins**. In block.

Mr. **Hayes**. Let me just make this brief comment, Mr. Secretary. There have been several references here to the dropout and reentry program which I authored. We passed H.R. 2281 in the House to extend this act.

You know, the funding runs out. I believe for another two years, if we would check under Chapter 1, part C, there are funds authorized, $400 million in 1990 and $450 million in 1991.

At your discretion, it could be used for further continuation of that program until such time as that the Senate decides to act. Now, my specific question that I am bothered by, other than making that comment, has to do with this merit concept in the public school system.

The merit school concept is an application of the business market concept to elementary and secondary schools. What will be the impact of the merit school payments on the provision of equal resources to pupils from low and high-income families, for guarantees are provided by your proposal to grant most funds from being grants to schools in high income areas.

This bothers me because currently, you mentioned about the reform program in Illinois; I don't know if it corrects the spending of $800 less on a student who attends school in the inner-city as opposed to the kid who attend a school in the suburban areas and where you spend—for example, 40 percent of the population in the state of Illinois is almost in Chicago and the surrounding areas.

Yet, only 25 percent of these educational dollars is spent on the system and I think that we need to correct this kind of inequity if we are really going to do some real improvement in the system itself.

Chairman **Hawkins**. Mr. Sawyer, would you care to get a question into the package?

Mr. **Sawyer**. I am not sure that I have time left to do that, Mr. Chairman. I just want to thank both the Secretary and Deputy Undersecretary Kolb for being here. It is good to see you again.

I particularly appreciate what you had to say about work place literacy in this country and how the importance of adult literacy in particular as a vanguard of dealing with the problems that we face immediately represents an opportunity that we simply cannot let pass.

I would invite your attention to a measure that I expect introduced tomorrow, that I would hope would be the sort of thing that is amendable to bipartisan support and a collaborative effort to achieve many of the goals that you have described here today.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman **Hawkins**. Thank you. Mr. Poshard.

Mr. **Poshard**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have more of a statement, I guess, than a question. Mr. Secretary, I do appreciate your being here, but I have been sitting here struggling with my anger a little bit over some of the statements that have been made and I have to be honest with you about that.

I don't think anybody disagrees with you that accountability needs to be brought into the system in this country, but I look at this bill and these programs and some of them may work.

The seed money concept bothers me greatly. It has never worked and it is not going to work with these programs either. Putting pennies into a school district to formulate a program and then expecting the locals to keep that going after a year or two years when they are having to raise local property taxes and choose between fire protection and police protection and education, it is a joke.

So, the idea of seed money for a few programs around the country is ridiculous. It is facile; it has never worked and it is not going to work for these programs either, in my judgment. The other thing that I have to say is this, I really get tired of hearing people say that we have been throwing money at education.

I have been involved in education professionally all my life and I don't ever recall a time when we have thrown money at education. In fact, it has always been one of the lowest programs on the fiscal priority list in this country.

Now, we have some social problems today that complicate the educational system in terms of home problems and divorce rates and everything else, but that doesn't mean that we are wasting money by putting more money into the system, and when I hear you make statements like we put 26 percent increase in education last year in this country Mr. Secretary, where is that?

I think that is an irresponsible statement for you to make. I don't understand that. Everything that I have seen over the years is that educational funding at the Federal level is decreasing. Where did we put 26 percent increase in education last year at the Federal level?

Now, those kinds of statements obfuscate the issue that we are all about here and I just think that it takes away from our ability to get the American public to see how crucial and how priority an issue education needs to become.

Chairman **Hawkins**. Well, Mr. Secretary, Mr. Hayes, as I understand it, expressed concerned that the dropout and re-entry program that is in operation now is not being funded. He thought that the merit school concept might injure low income students.

Mr. Sawyer expressed his concern about literacy in the work place. He was commendatory, in effect, and indicated that he was introducing a bill tomorrow that had to do with literacy and he expressed hope that you would cooperate with him.

Then, finally, Mr. Poshard said that he felt seed money is not enough, that we have got to make a heavier investment and felt that the phrase being used by some high-ranking officials that we are throwing money at education is not exactly accurate and that more should be done at the Federal level, rather than making this blank statement.

There seemed to be a number of things which you might wish to answer, and from now on, you are controlling the time.

Secretary CAVAZOS. I am on my time?

Chairman HAWKINS. I have no other questions.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Let me touch on the points that were brought out here and I appreciate the opportunity to review these with you rather quickly.

We certainly will look into the dropout program in Chapter 1, part C, and see what we can do in terms in our discretionary funds. The issue of how merit awards made under theschool program can be directed so that they do not just flow to one segment of our society, but instead take into consideration the needs of minority students, is a very cogent thought that we have carefully considered.

According to the criteria that we can use to identify a merit school, it is quite possible that a school has a high minority enrollment and has been able to reduce its dropout levels, increase its students test scores or had a drug-free campus could be selected to participate in this program.

As to the issue of work place literacy, sir, we will work with you on that. I have the same commitment and I applaud you for your efforts and we will work together. To the issue of seed money and dollars into the system, I perhaps did not make myself clear.

When I was referring to a 26 percent increase in funding, I did not mean to imply that funding at the Federal level increased by that amount. I was referring to the increase in funding that has occurred when Federal, state, and local funds are all added together. That was the figure that I was referring to and not referring to the amount spent by the department or proposed here.

I agree with you that seed money is not always the way to approach the problems we face, but what we have to do is to bring together all of the resources we can muster, in addition to the money we spend, to provide leadership on this issue to all American communities.

I am optimistic that we can solve the problems facing education in our Nation, but it is not going to be solved either unilaterally or through one or two little techniques. It is going to involve every one of us.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to be before your committee. I promise you again that we will respond to your questions that you submit to me in writing. I also promise, of course, to work with you to fashion the best bill that we can. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you. We are confident that you will. I wish to thank you on behalf of the committee for your generous contribution this morning, to the work of the committee and we look forward to a continuing dialogue with you.

You have our cooperation on that, I can assure you. Thank you very much.

Secretary CAVAZOS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Whereupon, the subcommittee concluded at 11:55 a.m.]

[Additional material submitted for the record follows.]

[illegible]

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
B-346C RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY,
AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

[illegible]

August 23, 1989

Honorable Lauro F. Cavazos
Secretary
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Thank you for presenting testimony before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education on H.R. 1675, the Educational Excellence Act, on August 2, 1989. Some of the Members have questions which they were not able to ask during the course of the hearing because of time constraints. Also, we are requesting information on several ongoing Department activities that bear directly and indirectly on the Administration's proposals.

In order that the Subcommittee may have the benefit of your thinking, I have compiled the additional questions which are attached. I would appreciate having your response by September 22.

Sincerely,

Gus Hawkins

Augustus F. Hawkins
Chairman

AFH:jjt

Enclosure

(The Committee questions appear in whole in the Secretary's responses.)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
THE SECRETARY

OCT 13 1989

Honorable Augustus F. Hawkins
Chairman
Committee on Education and Labor
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Enclosed are answers to the questions on the Educational Excellence Act that you sent to me on August 23, 1989. I hope these answers will be helpful to your Subcommittee as you mark up the bill.

I look forward to hearing your views and to working with you to fashion a bill that will be acceptable to both the Congress and the Administration and that, most of all, will result in the improvement of education for young people in this country.

Thank you for the courtesy you showed to me at the August 2 hearing on the President's legislative proposals. If there are issues on which you would like further explanation or information, please let me know, and I will do my best to provide it.

Sincerely,

Lauro F. Cavazos

Lauro F. Cavazos

Enclosure

Questions on H.R. 1675, the Educational Excellence Act

GENERAL ISSUES

Question: In the main, your proposals deal with rewarding schools, teachers, and students for doing well academically. Do you believe that is where the Federal Government should place its emphasis, especially since these schools and individuals are probably going to do well anyway regardless of whether they receive Federal awards?

Answer: Contrary to the premise of the question, the Educational Excellence Act is consistent with the principle that Federal dollars should be used to help those most in need. These programs would contribute to educational improvement for this segment of the population in several important ways. For example, they would encourage major restructuring of schools by giving parents an opportunity to select their children's schools, and they would encourage new and flexible systems of certifying teachers. Some of the new programs would reward progress toward excellence on the part of students, teachers, and schools. This kind of recognition is an important ingredient in the overall effort to improve the quality of education generally, and those who will benefit most from improvements in the quality of American education are students the educational system is currently failing.

Question: Let me state the question in a different way: today one-fourth of our public school students are poor, and by the year 2000, one-third of them will be poor. Shouldn't we be emphasizing Chapter 1, Even Start, and other programs focused on these students?

Answer: Many schools are struggling against difficult odds to create a decent learning environment for their students. Generally speaking, schools serving poor children have the most difficult problems to overcome. Programs in the Educational Excellence Act will help these schools and these students. The Presidental Merit Schools program, for example, will reward progress -- not perfection -- in dealing with some of the problems most common to schools serving children from low-income families: poor achievement in basic skills; unsafe and drug-ridden school environments; and high dropout rates. We expect this will provide an additional incentive for these schools to improve, and view it as direct support for the School Improvement emphasis in the Hawkins-Stafford Amendments to Chapter 1.

The Education Department budget in recent years has allocated about 85 percent of its resources to programs serving the disadvantaged, the handicapped, and needy postsecondary students. President Bush strongly supports this high priority for the disadvantaged, and he is convinced that programs in the Educational Excellence Act will complement existing programs in ways that will further benefit poor students.

Question: The same question has been put to us bluntly by the education appropriations bill. Chapter 1 receives a 20 percent increase in that bill -- $1 billion -- so that more disadvantaged children can receive the remedial education they need. But the same bill provides that if your proposals are enacted, $350,000,000 can be shifted from Chapter 1 to pay for them. In other words, fewer poor children will be served to fund your "merit schools" and "magnet schools of excellence." Is that proper? Is that good policy?

Answer: Given the fact that the House Appropriations Committee usually does not consider requests for programs that are not authorized, this was a very unusual step for the Committee to take, and we are very appreciative. The House Committee included an increase of almost $1 billion, or 23 percent, for Chapter 1 Grants to LEAs, the programs from which these funds would be transferred. Even if the Department were to transfer the full $350 million allowed by the Committee, the Chapter 1 LEA Basic and Concentration grant programs would still receive an increase of almost $600 million, or 14 percent, the highest dollar increase ever.

Furthermore, children eligible for Chapter 1 will benefit from both the Presidential Merit Schools program and Magnet Schools of Excellence:

- Distribution of Merit Schools funds to States will be based in part on the Chapter 1 formula.

- The emphasis in the Merit Schools program will be on encouraging and rewarding schools that are making progress in improving the learning environment, despite the presence of such obstacles as a high poverty rate. As noted earlier, this reinforces current efforts to improve Chapter 1 schools.

- Merit Schools awards would be based on progress in creating a safe and drug-free school environment, raising student achievement, and reducing the dropout rate -- all areas of vital importance to Chapter 1 schools.

- A major emphasis in the Magnet Schools of Excellence program will be on supporting schools that recognize the potential of children who are educationally disadvangated or who come from low-income families.

- Many children from low-income families live in school districts that have student enrollments close to 100 percent minority and are therefore not eligible for the desegregation-related Magnet Schools program. The many benefits of magnet schools should be extended to these children.

PRESIDENTIAL MERIT SCHOOLS

Question: Why do you propose authorizing a relatively large amount of money beginning at $250 million per year, rising to $500 million by fiscal year 1993 -- for the untried concept of "merit schools"? This concept of "bonus payments" to successful schools has been adopted only very recently and in a couple of States, with little evidence of its effects.

Answer: The $250 million that would be authorized for 1990 would provide for an average State grant of $4.4 million; the 1991 authorization of $350 million would result in an average grant of $6.1 million. We believe these amounts, far from being excessive, are appropriate for demonstrating that achievable standards of excellence can be set for all students and all schools, and that financial incentives can spur schools to rise to the challenge of meeting these standards.

The principles embodied by the Presidential Merit Schools program are not untried as the question suggests. The Department has seen very positive results from such recognition programs as the Blue Ribbon Schools programs. And the experience of a number of States with school recognition programs has convinced State legislators and other funding sources, such as foundations, that those programs provide well-deserved recognition as well as incentives for school-level improvement. For example:

- In Florida, the Quality Instructional Incentives Program awarded $10 million last year to districts that met their own objectives for improvement, based on plans negotiated with the State educational agency.
- In Georgia, evaluators chosen from outside the State select successful schools under the Schools of Excellence Recognition Program.
- In Minnesota, the Academic Excellence Foundation, a nonprofit public/private partnership, selects Quality Elementary Schools of Excellence for recognition. It also sponsors academic contests among schools for the purpose of recognizing superior academic effort and achievement.
- In Pennsylvania, the School Performance Incentive program makes cash awards to schools that demonstrate improvement in several areas.
- In South Carolina, the School Incentives Program, funded at $4.4 million last year, awards funds to schools that increase their achievement scores. Schools with the highest gains receive cash awards, with the amount of the award adjusted to reflect enrollment size and the number of children from low-income families.

Question: What will be the impact of merit school payments on the provision of equal resources to pupils from low- and high-income families? What guarantees are provided by your proposal to prevent most funds from being granted to schools in high-income areas?

Answer: While the legislative proposal does not contain absolute "guarantees" to prevent most Merit Schools funds from being granted to schools in high-income areas, we do not think such guarantees are needed. Schools will be selected based on their progress in (1) improving educational performance in basic skills, (2) achieving a safe school environment, and (3) reducing the dropout rate. These three areas suggest problems not usually associated with schools that serve privileged students from high-income families. In addition, States will have the authority to establish additional criteria and may set standards that give further consideration to schools with substantial numbers or proportions of children from low-income families.

Question: The merit schools concept is an application of business market concepts to elementary and secondary schools. Why are competitive market concepts appropriate for such a universal public service as elementary and secondary education?

Answer: David Kearns, the chairman of Xerox, has said, "To be successful, the new agenda for school reform must be driven by competition and market discipline....The public schools must change if we are to survive." We agree with Mr. Kearns, and we believe we must infuse our schools with the ingredients that are essential to any enterprise--enterpreneurship and accountability. Programs in the Education Excellence Act, such as Magnet Schools of Excellence, Presidential Merit Schools, and Presidential Awards for Excellence in Education, offer this opportunity. The possibility of receiving a cash bonus from the Presidential Merit Schools program should be as powerful an incentive for principals and teachers as similar programs are for workers in private industry. There are other factors that motivate people to do well, but recognition and reward must certainly be considered important factors as well. Competitive market concepts are not only appropriate for public education; their application is long overdue. We believe these concepts along with other reform efforts, hold great promise for school improvement.

Question: While your bill does provide for public control over instructional equipment and materials, it does not provide for public control of other uses of merit school grants by private schools. Why do you think it would be constitutional to provide merit school grants directly to private schools, to be spent solely as determined by private school officials, when control of all Federal aid funds must be maintained by public agencies in current elementary and secondary education programs?

Answer: We believe that the equitable treatment of parochial schools in the Presidential Merit Schools programs, subject to the safeguards provided in the proposal, would be consistent with the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment to the Constitution, because the program would be open to all schools on a neutral basis. Because of the limitations imposed by the Establishment Clause, a parochial school would not enjoy the full range of choices available to a public school. A parochial school could, nevertheless, use its award for such constitutionally permissible activities, listed in the legislation, as college scholarships for secondary school students, helping other schools to replicate its success, and arranging for the loan of textbooks to students, so long as a public agency holds title to, and exercises administrative control over, those books. It should be noted that a provision of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 that prohibits the use of money for religious worship or instruction would apply to the Presidential Merit Schools program. Each State educational agency would be responsible for ensuring that funds awarded to private schools under this program are used in accordance with that prohibition and with the Establishment Clause. Thus, while private schools will be free to decide which permissible activities to use their awards for, there will be substantial public control to ensure that funds are not used for constitutionally unacceptable activities.

Question: Why should we grant funds to any public or private school with no control over how those funds are used? What would prevent a grantee from using the grant to purchase such items as tennis courts or a swimming pool?

Answer: The Presidential Merit Schools program will provide a powerful incentive for schools to improve their educational performance. Accountability should work both ways. Just as a school might expect adverse consequences for poor performance (e.g., State takeover, parents choosing a different school for their children), schools should be encouraged to increase their accountability by developing programs that stem dropout rates or increase student achievment. The cash award that would come with selection as a Presidential Merit School is intended not so much to produce accountability as to reward it. We are confident, and the proposed legislation anticipates, that a school that wins one of these awards can be counted on to use it for activities that will make education even better for its students.

Question: With respect to private schools in particular, what is to prevent merit school grants from being made to highly selective, elitist schools, with high tuitions, large endowments, and a wealth of other advantages?

Answer: Just as we do not expect funds to flow to public schools serving predominantly high-achieving children from high-income families, it is unlikely that the kind of private school described in the question would receive a Merit Schools Award. These schools do not generally suffer from problems associated with low achievement in basic skills, unsafe school environments, and high dropout rates. Unless a school has had such problems, it could hardly be expected to show improvement in these areas and thus qualify for a Merit Schools award.

Question: Can you provide any more detailed information on the "minimum criteria" that you would establish for merit school grants?

Answer: The proposed legislation sets out three areas in which the Secretary would be required to establish minimum criteria. These are: (1) progress in improving educational performance, with particular emphasis on mastery of reading, writing, and mathematical skills; (2) the degree to which the school demonstrates progress in achieving and maintaining a safe environment, including reduction or elimination of problems related to drug and alcohol use; and (3) progress in reducing the number of students who drop out of school or in encouraging those who have dropped out to reenter school and complete their schooling.

In establishing these criteria, the Secretary will use the rulemaking process and will solicit public comment to ensure that the Department benefits from the ideas of school officials, parents, and the public in general. We would particularly welcome suggestions from the Congress on how the criteria could be framed.

Question: Why does your proposal provide only that State criteria for merit school selection may take student body composition -- such as the proportion of pupils from low income families -- into account? Would any criteria that did not take the student body's characteristics into account simply result in bonus grants to schools serving the affluent, those least in need of help?

Answer: As we have stated in answers to previous questions, we believe that fears about Merit Schools funds being drawn off by affluent schools and those least in need of help are groundless. The Federal selection standards that all States would be required to use deal with problems not usually associated with schools for the affluent. On top of these, States will have wide latitude for establishing additional criteria, including those that recognize the composition of the student body and those that give special consideration to schools with substantial numbers or proportions of children from low-income families.

ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION FOR TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Question: What have been the effects thus far of the alternative teacher certification program in the State of New Jersey? Have any other States followed New Jersey's lead in this area? If not, why?

Answer: Before the inauguration of its alternative certification program in September 1985, New Jersey, like many other States, faced twin shortages of teachers in its public schools: there were not enough teachers in certain subject areas, especially mathematics and the sciences; and there were also too few minority teachers in a State with large numbers of minority students.

However, the problem most immediately prompting the establishment of an alternative certification program was ineffectiveness and inefficiency in a long-established emergency certification procedure.

The success of the Provisional Teacher Program has begun to relieve New Jersey of these shortages and problems. The need for high quality teachers in various subjects has been met. The shortage of minority teachers is also being made up. Emergency certification, a relatively unstructured procedure, has been replaced by rigorous new certification procedures.

Alternatively certified teachers made up 32 percent of incoming teachers for the New Jersey public schools in 1988. While math and science shortages are being met, needed teachers are also being supplied for many other subjects, including English, languages, business subjects, and social studies. Half of the new teachers for the public elementary schools of New Jersey come from the ranks of alternatively certified teachers. Their performance has been strong: principals and traditionally certified colleagues are pleased with the performance of the new teachers.

An unexpected benefit has been the great interest in the program by minorities. The current corps of teachers in New Jersey public schools is 11 percent minority, while more than 32 percent of the students are minority. But in 1989, 29 percent of the alternatively certified teachers hired for the public schools are expected to be of minority background.

Other States have begun to establish their own alternative certification programs; among them are California, Texas, and Florida. Additional States are considering such programs, but none seem to be following the New Jersey example explicitly. The States seem to be experimenting according to their own resources, local circumstances, and needs.

Question: The determination of school teacher and administrator qualifications has always been a State responsibility. What is the rationale for federal intervention into this process?

Answer: The program we are proposing will not usurp State responsibilities to determine qualifications for school personnel. Our proposal seeks to encourage States to develop alternative certification requirements that are tailored to the States' individual circumstances. No Federal certification standards are to be developed through this effort.

The rationale for the Federal Government providing funds to encourage and assist States in developing and implementing alternative certification requirements is simply to improve the recruitment pool of well-qualified teachers and administrators. Our school children could benefit from the expertise of many talented professionals who have demonstrated their subject matter competence or leadership qualities in fields outside education. What is needed are alternate routes into teaching for these persons who have not gone through the conventional college of education training process, or into administration for those without teaching experience. The Federal role in this area is one of encouragement, assistance, and guidance through the sharing of information and exemplary efforts. Detailed matters of education policy will remain with States and local education agencies.

Question: If alternative teacher and administrator certification programs are successful, why will States not adopt them on their own, without Federal subsidy?

Answer: Approximately two dozen States have indeed established some alternative routes to enter the teaching profession. (It is hard to determine exactly how many States already have such programs because educators' and policymakers' definitions of "alternative" differ.) Yet, while many States are pursuing this approach to improving the recruitment pool of well-qualified teachers, it is in the best interest of the Nation that these efforts be reinforced, and that those States that have not yet developed their own programs be encouraged to do so.

It should also be noted that our proposal requires that funds awarded to the States be used to supplement, and not to supplant, any State or local funds available for the development and implementation of alternative teacher and principal certification requirements. This ensures that Federal funds would be used to expand upon existing efforts or begin programs in those States where none exist, not just to continue programs currently funded from other sources.

Question: Do any States currently have alternative administrator certification programs? If not, why?

Answer: No State has an alternative certification program for administrators as such. One State, New Jersey, has developed and is implementing a new administrator certification process, which was adopted by the State Board of Education in September 1988. This action is more an upgrading and expansion of the previous process than an alternate route, however.

While the merit of alternative certification to expand the talent pool is equally applicable to administrators and teachers, the market incentive of a shrinking supply of teachers is not present in the case of administrators. Yet, if alternate routes for administrators existed, schools could far more readily tap the talent of those with management and administrative backgrounds and proven leadership abilities.

Question: Do alternative teacher or administrator certification programs generally require individuals to eventually meet the "regular" certification requirements in order to maintain their job? If so, what has been gained through the alternative certification program?

Answer: No, these programs generally do not require individuals to eventually meet "regular" certification requirements. Mid-life professionals and retirees, two groups principally addressed by alternative certification, typically cannot afford to return to college for full-time studies, which regular certification requires. It is the very premise of alternative certification that, through a different mix of requirements, taking into account the constraints of full-time teaching, persons already having substantial academic training can become highly effective teachers. Evidence bears this out. The quality and quantity of teachers provided by existing alternative certification programs demonstrates the value and effectiveness of alternete routes into the profession.

Question: You may already support alternative teacher and administrator certification programs under your discretionary authorities of the Fund for Innovation in Education and the Fund for the Improvement and Reform of Schools and Teaching. Why do you need this additional authority?

Answer: Both the Fund for Innovation in Education and the Fund for the Improvement and Reform of Schools and Teaching will make a limited number of grants this year, about 60 each, for projects selected from among many applications. States applying to these programs for support for alternative certification programs would face competition from public, private, non-profit and profit-making institutions of every description from across the Nation proposing to implement a myriad of strategies for improving and reforming schools and teaching. Also, given continuation grant commitments, adequate funding would not be available in 1990 to assist each State with an alternative certification program even if they were all to apply and compete well. We believe that a separate formula-grant program, with one-time funding at the level we have proposed, is important both to provide an incentive for States to pursue this strategy for improving the teaching force and to guarantee assistance to those that want to do so.

BILINGUAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

Question: P.L. 100-436, which was enacted in September, 1988, included a provision in the appropriation language which called for a report from the Secretary on the status of the Bilingual Fellowships Program. The report was to be delivered no later than eight months after enactment to both the House and the Senate Appropriations Committee. Your Department did not deliver the report, and as a result $5 million has not been expended for 500 fellowships in FY 1989. What is the status of this report and the awards for FY 1989?

Answer: The 1989 Appropriations Act prohibited the Department from spending funds for the Bilingual Fellowship program until the Department submitted an interim report (due on May 20, 1989), and the Congress released these funds "under further statutory Act of Congress." The Department submitted the report on May 19, 1989. Subsequently, the Senate report language accompanying the Department's fiscal year 1989 supplementary appropriation directed the Department to "obligate these funds to the educational personnel training activities under Part C." Pursuant to those instructions, the $5,000,000 that had been reserved for the Bilingual Fellowship program is being used to make Educational Personnel Training Grants.

Question: P.L. 100-297 calls for a study on this same fellowship program. The study is due to the appropriate committees of Congress by December 31, 1991. What is the status of this study?

Answer: A contract for a study of the Bilingual Fellowship program was signed on September 30, 1988. This study is scheduled for completion by April 1990 and will produce information that will be used in the 1991 fellowship report.

LONGITUDINAL STUDY

Question: What is the status of the longitudinal study of bilingual education being conducted for the Department? What is the release date for this study?

Answer: The original contract for the national longitudinal evaluation of the effectiveness of services for language-minority limited English proficient students was awarded in fiscal year 1983. A contract to analyze the data collected during this five-year study was awarded in September 1988. The final report is due from the contractor by September 30, 1989. We expect to make the report available to the Congress shortly after we receive it.

FAMILY ENGLISH LITERACY

Question: P.L. 100-297 specifies that programs of family bilingual education may include instruction designed to enable aliens who are otherwise eligible for temporary resident status under Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act to achieve a minimum understanding of ordinary English and a knowledge and understanding of history and government of the United States as required by Section 312 of such Act. As deadlines for completing such education under P.L. 99-603 draw nearer, the provision of such courses is increasingly critical. To what extent has the Department publicized the availability of program funds for such activities?

Answer: Consistent with the 1988 amendments to the Bilingual Education Act, the Department issued new program regulations for the Family English Literacy program specifically listing the services you describe as allowable activities. The State Legalization Impact Assistance Program, administered by the Department of Health and Human Services, makes available approximately $100 million for such activities annually. In contrast, the 1989 budget for Family English Literacy was $4.7 million.

Question: Has the Department received applications to conduct such programs?

Answer: For fiscal year 1989, the Department received 144 eligible applications under the Family English Literacy program. Five of these applicants proposed programs of instruction for aliens in conjunction with intergenerational literacy instructional activities.

Question: Has the Department funded such programs?

Answer: The Department made 15 awards for new Family English Literacy projects in fiscal year 1989 in addition to 20 awards for non-competitive continuation projects. None of the five applicants proposing instruction for aliens were ranked highly enough in the competitive process to be funded.

DEVELOPMENTAL BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Question: Developmental bilingual education is a fundamental activity under Title VII of P.L. 100-297. The Committee report for the appropriations bill for FY 1990 (H.R. 2990) specifies that the funds added by the Committee are to be reserved for grants for programs of developmental bilingual education. What are your plans for enhancing and expanding that program?

Answer: The purpose of developmental bilingual education projects is to teach a foreign language to native English speakers and strengthen native language skills of limited English proficient students as well as to teach English. The Department's general policy has been that the limited Federal funding available for bilingual education should be directed to programs that teach English to limited English proficient students. The Department has recently been considering using a small amount of funding to demonstrate and test the developmental approach. In addition, the House has recommended an increase, in fiscal year 1990, for bilingual education, some of which, under language in the House committee report, would be earmarked for developmental programs. If the final version of the 1990 appropriations act confirms the House directive, the Department will, of course, comply.

NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF ADULT LITERACY

Question: What is the status of the national assessment to determine the nature and extent of adult illiteracy? To what extent will this include representative information on limited-English-proficient adult illiteracy? To what extent will it include information on the supply and effectiveness of literacy programs that serve these Americans?

Answer: The award for the National Assessment of Adult Literacy will be made very shortly. This study will be completed in 1993 and will produce information on the literacy skills of limited-English-proficient adults based on a representative sample of this population. The literacy assessment will not produce information on the supply and effectiveness of literacy programs to serve limited-English-proficient adults, although the Department is undertaking other activities to address this question, including a study to document funding from all Federal programs that support adult education and a national study of the Federal Adult Education program.

STUDIES OF LITERACY PROGRAMS

Question: What, in addition to the national assessment, has the Department done to determine the adequacy and effectiveness of current services from all sources (including the public and private sectors) for workplace literacy and for building English literacy skills of limited-English-proficient adults and out-of-school youths?

Answer: The Department, together with the Departments of Labor and Health and Human Services, is beginning a study of Federal programs that provide adult education services. This study will produce detailed information on the amount of Federal funding and, to the extent possible, the volume of services provided under all Federal programs. This study will not include a survey of private efforts; privately funded adult education activities permeate nearly every community and would require an extremely expensive study to document.

LITERACY TRAINING FOR THE LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT

Question: What has been done to ensure that basic State grants under the Adult Education Act include adequate provisions of appropriate literacy education services to these populations?

Answer: States are required to describe, in their Adult Education State plans, how they will provide for the special needs of individuals with limited or no English proficiency by providing appropriate assistance to enable such individuals to progress effectively through adult education programs. The Department's new regulations for Adult Education reiterate this requirement and the requirement that the State plans describe how the needs of all educationally disadvantaged adults will be addressed. The Department has worked closely with the State directors of adult education to make them aware of the requirements of the Adult Education Act and the full range of services they may provide using Federal funds. According to recent State reports, approximately one-third of all participants in adult education programs are limited-English-proficient adults seeking English-as-a-second-language training.

ENGLISH LITERACY GRANT PROGRAM

Question: Have any grants been made under the English Literacy Grant program? What is the status of the national literacy clearinghouse, with its mandate for training and material development, as well as traditional ERIC clearinghouse functions of collection and dissemination of materials on literacy? Actions have been taken to strengthen this clearinghouse's role as a center for collection, analysis, and dissemination of literacy education under various programs and agencies. What impact would termination of funding have on these activities? What are the Department's plans for implementing this vital program?

Answer: Grants to States under the English Literacy Grant program will be made in November 1989, when the regulations governing this new program become effective. The award for the National Clearinghouse on Literacy Education for Individuals of Limited-English Proficiency will be made in September 1989. However, this clearinghouse has no statutory authority to provide training or materials development; it will be operated as an adjunct ERIC clearinghouse.

The Adult Education Act authorizes the Division of Adult Education to conduct training and materials development for this program. The Division of Adult Education is currently developing curriculum materials for use in literacy programs for limited-English-proficient adults.

Elimination of funding for the English Literacy Grant program would result in the termination of the adjunct ERIC clearinghouse; however, the States would continue to provide extensive literacy training services for the limited-English proficient under the Adult Education basic State grant program.

[illegible]
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS
[illegible]
SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ
[illegible] District, California

[illegible]
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
[illegible]

August 3, 1989

Honorable Lauro F. Cavazos
Secretary of Education
Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Thank you for your testimony this morning on the Educational Excellence Act of 1989 (H.R. 1675) and related topics. I look forward to working with you to provide effective opportunities for educational excellence for all Americans. As I indicated during the hearing, I would like information on several ongoing activities at the Department. The more specific queries regarding program activities have been included in a letter that is being sent to you by members of the Committee under the signature of Chairman Hawkins.

I have been delighted to see the statements that you and others in the Administration have given to highlight the need to develop a nation of readers. I look forward to working with you to end illiteracy in America. As you indicated in your testimony, this should include broad-based efforts to build literacy. Support for pre-reading activities in programs for young children (such as Head Start and Even Start) , and programs for older children (such as Bilingual Education and Chapter I) which develop these skills are vital. I fully agree with you that broad programs geared to meet the needs of out of school youths and adults--such as the Chapter I dropout prevention programs, the Adult Basic Education programs and the Bilingual Education family bilingual education programs--are important. I am pleased to note your request for an 18% increase in formula grants to the states under Adult Education for programs which teach basic skills (including literacy) and which help adults attain high school credentials. While full funding for this vital program would be far more appropriate in meeting America's human investment deficit, 18% is a useful if modest start. However, modest increases and untargeted activities will do little to build a nation of readers.

While more of the same is an important part of the answer, it is not an adequate answer. Data from your Department and other sources make it starkly clear that a major proportion of the nation's illiterates are adults and out of school youths whose first language is not English. Moreover, the rapidly changing technological demands and the aging of the workforce make literacy programs in the workplace particularly important to sustain and increase our ability to compete in world markets. The problem is particularly severe for small businesses which can usually ill-afford to provide literacy training. Evidence from across the country clearly shows that too little is being done to build workplace literacy skills and to support effective literacy programs for limited English proficient adults and out of school youths. States are often failing to give the emphasis to these special populations that demographics and competitiveness require. The requirements of the immigration law make these inadequacies even more troubling.

It is for these reasons that Congress created the Workplace Literacy and the English Literacy Grant programs. Mandating these programs in two major statutes--the trade bill and the Hawkins-Stafford Act--was a clear and conscious effort by Congress to improve the targeting of Federal resources to stimulate the creation of State and local community-based programs that meet these needs.

Despite this pressing need and clear Congressional intent, the President's budget recommended zero funding for the English Literacy Grant program, which I authored, and for the Workplace Literacy program, asserting that the programs duplicate State grant authority. It is not appropriate for the Department to be exercising "a little bit of academic deregulation" by getting rid of these categorical programs that expressly drive money to largely unmet needs which are not being adequately served by broader State grant programs. In both public and private programs there is a tremendous inertia, a tendency to keep doing what has been done before. If America is to meet these challenges, we must reach beyond the traditional classroom and the traditional bureaucracy. The Workplace Literacy and the English Literacy Grant programs do this. As you know, concern has also been expressed in Senate hearings about the Administration's failure to seek funding for these vital programs.

A stop-and-start policy of funding literacy activities is harmful enough for demonstration type programs. It is particularly damaging when basic infrastructure--such as the national literacy education clearinghouse established by P.L. 100-297--are involved. What is your Department's strategy for meeting the special needs in building literacy skills in the workplace and for the limited-English proficient adult or out of school youth? What infrastructure is in place or being established to assess "what works" in these programs and to effectively disseminate this information in usable form to those battling illiteracy in our communities?

Secondly, I am deeply troubled by the approach embodied in H.R. 1675. Most of the activities of any substance in this bill are already permited under Hawkins-Stafford and other statutes. In this regard, I find it very puzzling that the Department has been so laggard in implementing the provisions of the Hawkins-Stafford School Improvement Amendments. It might raise questions in the mind of some whether the Administration prefers rhetoric to action. I choose to wait and see.

As the owner-operator of a small business for over a quarter of a century, I am a strong supporter of the free market system. Markets are highly efficient means of coordinating supply and demand in a wide variety of contexts. However, as economists know all too well, markets often are not perfect. Failure can stem from a number of causes: externalities (e.g. when the cost of a drop-out is not borne by the educational system, or when schools recruiting from a small segment of the population fail to help equip students to participate in the broader American community), by the abuse of market power (e.g. by prep schools "creaming" the best and the brightest students from less adequately financed schools), and imperfect information (which can leave buyers and sellers poorly equipped to make rational decisions). And since it takes money to play the market, those without money (and without the information and contacts and options that money buys) will increasingly be left out. So-called school "choice" programs--if not carefully tailored to meet these concerns--would result in what one study commissioned by the Department termed a "new improved sorting machine" that increases polarization and undercuts productivity in America, while undercutting the public schools that have built our nation and have kept it democratic and prosperous. The Administration's emphasis on prep schools and secular schools is particularly puzzling in view of international comparisions where the nations that out perform the U.S. on various measures of educational achievement rely far more heavily on public schools than do we. Market models, international comparisons, and our own history raise fundamental concerns about the approach in H.R. 1675. Essentially, H.R. 1675 fails to build on what works.

As you pointed out in your testimony, it would be unwise to throw our nation's schools into any greater educational deficit. An inside-the-Beltway mentality of proposing sweeping changes in education with little attention to what really is happening in our nation's classrooms is folly. The world of reality as we see it from the top and the view from the bottom does not change for all the rhetoric we hear. Clearly, not enough is being done to build excellence in education. Nobody identifies early enough what an individual child's needs are and to what pedagogy that child will respond to and learn by. We stick 20 or more children with one teacher teaching one way--and others don't care so long as they can point to some sort of success. But many reports, including A Nation At Risk suggest that the success rate is small and getting smaller. So called "choice" would deny real choice and community to students and teachers.

In practice, the children of the poor would take what they can get and hopefully make something out of it. If they are very lucky they will become part of the middle class. It is the poor who need the guarantees of quality education the most--and allowing a few elite schools to "cream" the best students while concentrating the students with problems in an academic ghetto will only intensify these problems and undercut the American community. The Administration's proposals for so-called "choice" would come at the detriment of schools which are already underfunded and inadequately staffed. And while seeking more choice for school admissions committees, the Administration's proposals often seek to narrow the choices open to teachers and students in schools. What we ought to be doing is making sure that every school provides quality education to every student, regardless of whether that child lives in a neighborhood where property values are high or low.

When you and I were children there were three types of schools: those for Anglos, those for Hispanics, and those for Blacks. In almost every case only the first type provided quality education. A lucky few Hispanic children, whose parents appreciated the importance of education and who were able to slip past the barriers, were able to attend the schools of the white kids. Many of the Hispanics now in leadership roles were able to benefit from this. Over the last several decades battles for desegregation have broken down many of the legal barriers that separated kids.

Today, the real issue is not legal desegregation--it is economics. Today the real minority is the economically disadvantaged--whatever the color of their skin. H.R. 1675 does not address this issue; it calls yet again for what has not been implemented and it fails to go on to build on what works.

I look forward to working with you for programs that truly build educational excellence and educational opportunity for all Americans.

Sincerely,

Matthew G. Martinez

MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ
Member of Congress

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION

TESTIMONY
OF THE
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

ON THE
EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION ACT OF 1989
H.R. 1675

SUBMITTED TO THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL
EDUCATION
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 2, 1989

MARY HATWOOD FUTRELL, President • KEITH GEIGER, Vice President • ROXANNE E. BRADSHAW, Secretary-Treasurer
DON CAMERON, Executive Director (202) 822-7300

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

The 1.9 million-member National Education Association represents professional and support employees in public elementary, secondary, vocational, and postsecondary schools throughout the nation. We appreciate this opportunity to testify on the role the federal government can play in maintaining the drive toward excellence and equity in public education.

Approximately two years ago, this Committee began its work on the reauthorization of a dozen essential federal elementary and secondary education programs. Those efforts were grounded in a recognition that individual students have unique needs, that some students require special assistance to succeed in school and in life, and that schools must have sustained assistance to be able to provide quality educational services for disadvantaged students, students with limited proficiency in English, and other students at risk. After careful study, this Committee acknowledged that federal education programs such as Chapter 1 compensatory education for disadvantaged students worked well and deserved to be continued. And at the same time, this Committee established new programs — such as concentration grants, dropout prevention, and parental involvement — that were developed based on the recommendations of teachers, administrators, parents, and others with a strong interest and experience in education.

The process by which the Education and Labor Committee developed these education programs reflects a model for developing ways to provide meaningful assistance to students and public schools. Too often, particularly in recent years, wellintentioned people have attempted to make changes in education without an adequate assessment of what the most pressing needs are, without consulting with professionals in the field, or by striking out on a parallel track, or even a divergent track, rather than building on the foundation that already exists.

NEA would be the first to admit there is still work to be done in advancing the goals of excellence and equity in education. We have long advocated a full commitment to specific elementary and secondary education programs that have proven successful, such as Chapter 1, handicapped education, bilingual education, Indian education, and the rest. We have long advocated a full commitment to programs that meet the human needs of disadvantaged children, including child care, nutrition and health programs, programs to stem the tide of chemical dependency, juvenile delinquency, and sexual promiscuity. We have long advocated a significant general aid program to help local communities meet their responsibility to maintain and operate the public schools. We have advocated new programs to meet emerging challenges in education: a greater emphasis on education personnel development, including programs to encourage more ethnic and racial minorities to enter the teaching profession; programs to encourage a more collegial approach to problem-solving at the local level, including assistance for site-based decision-making, professional development resource centers; school restructuring based on local needs and locally determined goals; and programs to improve the standards for entering and incentives for remaining in the teaching profession, as well as providing ongoing assistance to stay current in subject matter and methodology.

NEA is not alone in its commitment to effective programs to help continue the drive toward excellence and equity in education. The Committee for Economic Development has compiled a number of reports in recent years calling for a significant investment in education and outlining a number of specific programs that schools and communities, with assistance from state and federal governments, can initiate to address the real needs in education. In its 1987 report, "Children In Need: Investment Strategies for the Educationally Disadvantaged," CED reminded Americans that "raising standards for all students without increased efforts to help those who may not meet those standards will go only part way in realizing the nation's educational goals." It called for the nation to embark on a "third wave" of education reform "that gives the highest priority to early and sustained intervention in the lives of disadvantaged children." The public schools alone cannot make the kind of progress the public expects. It calls for a sustained community effort with the close involvement and support of parents and other family members. CED called for a greater emphasis on prenatal and postnatal care for pregnant teens and other high-risk mothers; parenting education for both mothers and fathers, family health care, and nutritional guidance; quality child care arrangements for poor working parents that stress social development and school readiness; and quality preschool for all disadvantaged 3- and 4-year-olds.

This Committee and this Congress have an opportunity to exert leadership in these areas so that — in cooperation with state and local government, with the private sector and individual families — all children have access to these services.

In terms of the structure of the public schools, CED advocates school-based management that involves principals, teachers, parents, and other school personnel in shared decision-making and accountability; smaller schools and smaller classes; up-to-date educational technology integrated into the curriculum to provide new learning opportunities for students; additional pedagogical support for teachers; support systems within the schools that include health services, nutritional guidance, and psychological, career, and family counseling; and increased emphasis on extracurricular activities that help build academic, social, or physical skills.

In short, the CED recommendations, like NEA's recommendations, constitute a comprehensive program for reform and renewal in public education. These recommendations are grounded in a close, longitudinal study of the public schools, and the students and educators who populate them, and consider what resources and programs they must have to fulfill the expectations of the American people and the future needs of our nation. No one is suggesting that providing those resources and developing and maintaining those programs will be an easy task. But the fact is America is changing, its people, its economy, and its institutions are changing, and the public schools must be transformed — not merely to reflect societal changes up to now — but to lead our nation forward into the future.

The Excellence in Education Act

The programs embodied in the Excellence in Education Act are marginal at best, and some would be leadership in the wrong direction.

The structure of the Excellence in Education Act of 1989 is sound. It has the appearance of being a major education initiative. Its findings are, for the most part, beyond challenge. It has components that are designed to address several different aspects of our educational system. It includes some resources to carry out its objectives. It emphasizes state and local control. However, it is unclear how this measure does anything meaningful to address the key needs of public schools or students. This proposal falls far short of providing the kind of design, resources, or leadership to initiate any of the recommendations NEA, CED, or any other organization with experience in the strengths and weaknesses of the public school have advanced in recent years.

There are positive elements in this package. For instance, NEA supports an increase in the endowment grants for Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and we support assistance to school districts to address the scourge of drugs that threatens the future of America's youth. The Drug-Free Schools Urban Emergency Grants and the endowment awards to the Historically Black Colleges and Universities would build on an existing framework, they would address real needs, and they would provide resources to accomplish goals established by the education community.

The National Science Scholars Program is a nice idea. But compared to the widening gap between the costs of postsecondary education and the level of assistance provided under existing federal student aid programs, the $5 million it would provide in FY90 is less than a drop in the bucket.

Recognition versus Meaningful Assistance

We simply cannot fool ourselves. Providing awards to schools for their accomplishments as in the Merit Schools program is not even icing on the cake; it is the decorative cherry one would place in the center of the cake after it has been frosted. At a time when most people are talking about the need to establish national goals in education, this program would reward local schools for meeting their own criteria. At a time of limited federal resources, it is counterproductive to devote this level of resources to a program that, in effect, duplicates existing state and local recognition programs. More importantly, the Merit Schools plan fails to provide a sustained commitment to public schools with serious obstacles to achieving meaningful education reform and improvement. A one-time grant would not enable schools to establish new programs or pay teachers more, or address the physical deterioration of schools. At a time when budgetary restrictions bring every expenditure under close scrutiny, it's important to meet the greatest needs first.

Giving out prizes for doing well is not the first or greatest need.

In addition, the proposed legislation would provide $100 million in FY90 for Magnet Schools of Excellence. Again, this change would tend to undermine longstanding efforts at the state and local level to establish a positive route toward desegregation. Instead, this proposal is intended to promote open enrollment, a concept which is at best an untested experiment and at worst the path to a massive resegregation of the public schools — by ability, by race, and by class.

Leadership in the Wrong Direction

Some components of the Excellence in Education Act are, in fact, leadership in the wrong direction. In the last two decades, states have devoted considerable time and effort to strengthening the requirements necessary to ensure a qualified teacher is present in every classroom. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards — which is designed to promote the improvement and standardization of preservice and inservice education for professional educators — is still in its infancy. At the same time, more than half the states already have escape hatches to allow persons without such training to cover classrooms. And now this measure would provide states $25 million in FY90 to explore new ways to circumvent existing certification standards.

There are no shortcuts to excellence. In March 1989, the Rand Center for the Study of the Teaching Profession released a study entitled, "Redesigning Teacher Education: Opening the Door for New Recruits to Science and Mathematics Teaching." After looking at several alternatives to teacher education, the Rand study concluded that, as a group, alternative certification recruits were the least satisfied with their coursework, the least satisfied with their practicum, and in most cases the most frustrated in the lack of preparation for the classroom. Proponents of alternative certification tend to downplay the importance of pedagogical training, but according to the Rand study, "the most frequently mentioned need was for additional coursework in teaching methods...Alternative certification recruits wished they had had training in teaching methods and classroom management before they entered the classroom..." The Rand report concludes that "the nontraditional programs that follow a more 'traditional' preparation approach—providing substantial pedagogical coursework before recruits enter the classroom and providing supervision and graduated assumption of responsibility during an internship—are more effective in the eyes of their participants and graduates. Programs that severely truncate coursework and place candidates on the job without adequate preparation or supervision are, not surprisingly, least well-rated by recruits."

Furthermore, the Rand report questions whether scientists and engineers are a viable pool for recruiting teachers. The National Science Foundation reports that of 21,423 respondents employed in scientific and technical occupations in 1970, only 121 switched to precollege teaching during the course of the decade, most taught for only one or two years, and after 10 years, only three remained in the classroom. The Rand study reports about 4 percent of these 21,423 scientists had education degrees, but only 0.2 percent were teaching at the K-12 level, concluding "for this group, 'defectors' outnumbered entrants to teaching by a ratio of 20 to 1."

In our view, Mr. Chairman, the $25 million proposed to encourage states to explore alternative certification procedures would be far better invested through funding the research for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards as proposed in S. 478, as introduced by you and Senator Dodd.

Since 1857, NEA has been dedicated to improving the teaching profession. And toward that end, we have supported efforts to improve the compensation of teachers and other education employees in order to attract and retain qualified individuals in education professions. One of our first and most enduring goals as an organization is to assure that there is a qualified teacher in every classroom. And in our view, the Presidential Awards for Excellence in Education component of this bill does not lead us toward that end. All teachers should be fairly compensated for the service they perform, and one cannot get around that basic fact. A one-shot $5,000 award for a relative handful of teachers is not nearly effective as efforts to identify, recruit, and prepare qualified individuals to education careers, efforts to strengthen the standards and certification for those entering the profession, and efforts to provide professional compensation for all education employees.

There Are Alternatives

The Excellence in Education Act, as introduced, would authorize more than $2.2 billion over four years to state and local education agencies. The largest component of this Act, the Merit Schools program, would devote more than $1.5 billion to a recognition program that amounts to little more than a pat on the head to schools and communities that face serious obstacles in their efforts to prepare our nation's young people to address the educational, social, and economic challenges of the next century. This Committee has more than just a track record of establishing significant education programs; it has a proud tradition. Over the past three decades, Congress — under the leadership of the Education and Labor Committee — enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1974, and the dozens of other programs that have made an enduring contribution, not only to public education, but to the lives of the millions of Americans public education has touched and continues to touch each year. The legislation before you does not build on that foundation; it is more of a stroll down the garden path.

America's public schools and the students served in them deserve more than the rhetoric, rewards, and redundancy this measure offers. At present, only about one-half of the students eligible to participate in compensatory education programs actually receive services. The appropriations for the state grant portion of the Education for All Handicapped provides only about 7 percent of the costs above average per pupil expenditures, far short of the 40 percent Congress pledged to provide when the programs were established. FY89 appropriations for bilingual education programs is sufficient to serve only about one-sixth of the students reported by states as limited English-proficient. The first, the most important step Congress could take toward excellence in education should be to provide funding for the full range of existing programs that extends access to all eligible students. Second, Congress should establish a comprehensive network of programs to address the academic, nutritional, health care, and social needs of our nation's disadvantaged children. Third, Congress should provide the resources that will enable school districts to expand and strengthen programs in the areas our children will need to be successful in the future. When that agenda is completed, there will be no need for a recognition program for schools for accomplishing what they all ought to be doing now.

Finally, in this time of limited resources, we are deeply concerned that funds for new programs not come at the expense of existing federal education programs that we know work. Chapter 1, bilingual education, handicapped education, and the rest are seriously underfunded; after accounting for inflation, federal elementary and secondary education programs have lost $4.2 billion since 1980. If this Committee does move forward with any of the elements of the Excellence in Education Act, the programs should be financed with new funds.

We commend this Committee for its work in developing and supporting programs that help state and local education agencies address the needs of our nation's young people, and we look forward to working with this Committee in the ongoing process of monitoring and refining existing programs, and developing new programs to maintain the national drive toward excellence and equity in education.

VERNE A. DUNCAN
Oregon Superintendent
of Public Instruction

President-Elect
WILLIAM B. KEENE
Delaware Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Vice President
(VACANT)

Directors
RICHARD A. BOYD
Mississippi Superintendent
of Education

JERRY L. EVANS
Idaho Superintendent
of Public Instruction

HERBERT J. GROVER
Wisconsin Superintendent
of Public Instruction

RUTH E. RANDALL
Minnesota Commissioner
of Education

WERNER ROGERS
Georgia Superintendent
of Schools

CHARLIE G. WILLIAMS
South Carolina Superintendent
of Education

Executive Director
GORDON M. AMBACH

Council Statement for the Record

on

Administration's Proposed Educational Excellence Act of 1989

by

Gordon M. Ambach
Executive Director

for the

House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education

August 2, 1989

Education
. . . a sound investment in
AMERICA

COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS
379 Hall of the States, 400 North Capitol Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001-1511
202 393-8161 • FAX 202 393-1228

The Council of Chief State School Officers commends President Bush for advancing the legislative initiatives of the Educational Excellence Act of 1989, H.R. 1675. The Council commends, also, Chairman Hawkins, Representative Goodling and the members of the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education for holding the hearing August 2 1989, for consideration of the proposal and opportunity for public comment.

Our Council believes that the objectives which underpin the President's program are best achieved through significant amendments to and increases in funds for current federal programs such as Chapter One, Public Law 94-142, bilingual education, vocational education, magnet schools and other statutes which provide access to education of quality. The Administration's proposals, with modification, can provide important additions to current programs if two conditions obtain: first, these initiatives must not draw limited resources from existing, proven programs; second, the initiatives must be linked carefully to current federal program priorities and structures and to state and local efforts and reforms addressed to advancing the quality of education.

Overview

The centerpiece of H.R. 1675 is Title I, Part A, Presidential Merit Schools. To assure effective use of federal funds for such a recognition program, it is essential to connect the concept and use of merit awards with the current, central federal program, Chapter 1 of the Hawkins-Stafford Amendments. We advance suggestions to accomplish this below.

We also urge amendments to several other parts of H.R. 1675 to provide that the administration of these parts will efficiently and effectively take advantage of the capacities of state education agencies as partners with the federal government in the administration of federal education programs. These amendments are particularly important for administration of the Presidential Awards for Excellent Teachers.

Merit Schools

We support the concept of recognizing meritorious performance. We urge that this concept be joined with the recently enacted provisions for Chapter 1 program improvement of the Hawkins-Stafford Act. This $250 million program of awards should be joined with the procedures for identifying schools most needing improvement in order to reward those schools which make significant gains through program improvement plans. This would provide a powerful incentive for education reform and would reward accomplishment where most needed in American education.

Public Law 100-297, the Hawkins-Stafford Act, provides, for the first time, a means for state and local education agencies (SEAs and LEAs) to identify those schools receiving Chapter 1 funds which are not achieving net gains or which are losing ground in student performance. The law requires LEAs and SEAs to take steps for improvement school by school. The merit award program should reward those schools which make significant improvement.

State education agencies worked this school year with committees of local practitioners to develop statwide plans to implement the new requirements. Schools in need of improvement were identified based on current data, and in the fall of the 1989-1990 school year, the schools identified in each of the states will work with their local education agency through a plan for improvement. Over the years, in each state, this process will provide performance data to enable determination of progress, or lack of it, in the schools most needing help. This process is ready-made for use in identifying the real success stories of improvement. These successful examples are exactly the ones which should be recognized through the merit schools program and rewarded with funds to enable further progress.

By coupling together Chapter 1 program improvement and merit schools, the President and Congress can meet the dual objectives of focusing federal spending on economically and educationally disadvantaged students and encouraging hard work and achievement by financial incentives.

The authorization of funding for merit schools under Chapter 1 should include a trigger, similar to that adopted by the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee recently in reporting out the Smart Start Program. This would link appropriations for merit school recognition to the total Chapter 1 appropriation and, particularly, the full funding of state program improvemeent services. Connecting these authorizations would advance the goal Congress adopted almost unanimously--to serve all children eligible for Chapter 1 by 1993 and to assure support and incentives are available for those schools most in need of improvement.

State Administration of the Initiatives

To assure maximum effectiveness in administration of federal education programs, it is essential to use existent state education administrative capacity. Recommendations for administration of the several parts of the proposed Educational Excellence Act of 1989 are summarized in the attached comments.

Our Council appreciates the opportunity to submit a statement on the President's initiatives. We have draft amendments for use of Subcommittee members and staff and would welcome the opportunity to assist with this legislation.

Comments on the Proposed Educational Excellence Act of 1989

Administrative Responsibilities for the Several Parts

August 2, 1989

The proposed Act has a variety of patterns for administering the federal initiatives. Federal education programs are most effective when administered through state education agencies (SEA). This pattern enables coupling of federal with state resources and the use of existent state administrative capacity rather than creation of added federal bureaucracy. The following comments identify those parts of the Act which require revision to take advantage of existent state education agency capacity for federal program administration:

Title I, Part A, Presidential Merit Schools

The Merit Schools Program is implemented through the state education agency which prepares an application, sets the criteria, and makes a determination on which schools will be rewarded as merit schools. This administrative structure should be maintained.

Title I, Part B, Magnet Schools of Excellence

Under this program the U.S. Department of Education administers funds directly to local education agencies, intermediate education agencies, or consortia of such agencies. There is no provision for application under a state plan or for SEA review. There is no review of applications from local agencies by the state education agency. This program should be administered through SEAs.

Title I, Part C, Alternative Certification for Teachers and Principals

The administering agency for grants made by the Secretary of Education is "the State." The bill should explicitly make the state education agency the administering agency.

Title I, Part D, Presidential Awards for Excellence in Education

Under this program an application to participate is submitted to the Secretary by the governor of each state. A selection panel to choose the teachers is selected by the governor in consultation with the chief state school officer. This procedure departs from the well-established processes of teacher recognition which the states have been using for forty years. The current Teacher of the Year (TOY) program provides for selection of teachers who demonstrate outstanding performance by the SEA and a nonpartisan panel of education experts. The process is objective and efficient. No new administrative machinery is needed for this task. This program should be operated as part of the TOY process through each SEA each year.

(Continued)

Title II, National Science Scholars

Under this program the President designates scholars who are nominated by the states. Each state nominates at least four but not more than ten students from each Congressional district within the state. The proposal is silent on which entity within the state handles the nomination and what process is set up in each Congressional district for making the nominations. No reference is made to the SEA. The program should be operated by the SEAs in conjunction with local education agencies (LEAs).

Title III, Drug-free Schools, Urban Emergency Grants

Under this program the Drug-free Schools and Communities Act of 1986 is amended with a special provision for urban emergency grants. The Secretary of Education awards such grants to local education agencies with no review or comment by the SEA. There is no requirement to connect these grants with the state plan and administration for the drug-free schools federal program. This title should provide for SEA review and comment to the Secretary on each proposal as it relates to the state plan before any award by the Secretary.

American
Association
of Colleges
for
Teacher
Education

One Dupont Circle, Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036-2412
202/293-2450

STATEMENT
OF THE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
ON H.R. 1675
THE EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE ACT OF 1989
SUBMITTED TO THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
OF THE
EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 2, 1989

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education submits the following statement, for the record, in regard to H.R. 1675, the Educational Excellence Act of 1989.

While AACTE commends the Bush administration for its interest in education and stated commitment to improving the quality of schooling in the United States, we believe certain strategies suggested by the administration are ill-conceived. Our particular concerns are directed to Title I, PART C of H.R. 1675, "Alternative Certification for Teachers and Principals Program." We agree with the first three findings for this part. Clearly, schools require competent teachers, good persons should be recruited into the profession, and if certain individuals from other professions may wish, at some point to shift careers and enter teaching; competent and caring individuals should be encouraged to do so. It does not follow, however, that standards established to protect children from those who could potentially do them harm should be relaxed or eliminated to essentially promote entry into teaching or school administration for a particular class of persons.

Knowledge of subject matter or experience in life do not, alone, prepare persons for the responsibilities of teaching. Before a person enters a classroom as a teacher he or she must be prepared to do more than disseminate information. Teachers must possess a thorough grasp of the knowledge base undergirding teaching practice, a repertoire of instructional strategies, and the skills to apply these to the education of individual students; he or she must understand and use methods of inquiry and research in making professional decision; he or she must have a comprehensive understanding of methods of student assessment and measurement including use of observations, design of standardised examinations, and how to interpret and use the results of these evaluation; and he or she must be able to transcend his or her own personal experiences in the classroom as students, and subsequently as teachers, in order to make instructional decisions based on professional knowledge.

The need for specialised preparation prior to being given classroom responsibility does not mean that individuals who already hold undergraduate or graduate degrees and have experience in other professions must undertake an identical professional preparation program as persons beginning their undergraduate preparation. Programs to prepare "non-traditional" persons for careers in teaching have existed for decades and may be found in thousands of colleges and universities across the United States. The fundamental differences between these traditional programs and and alternatives are in the target audience, the training design, and the length of training, not in program content, rigor or expected outcomes.

The administration's proposal attempts to create something that already exists and in so doing treads on states' responsibilities to determine teacher credentialling standards. As noted previously, many colleges and universities, often working with state agencies and school districts, provide sound professional preparation for non-traditional students who seek careers in teaching. In addition, the Federal government already provides an opportunity for those who want to establish such programs to receive seed money through Fund for the Improvement and Research on Schools and Teaching (FIRST) to do so. This program is in place and appropriations have been made for it. To create a new program, that essentially duplicates something already in place is an unwise use of limited federal resources. Further, since the allocation of funds for the Alternative Certification Program would go to all states on a formula basis, it may quickly be interpreted as a mandate. It is at this point, that states may very correctly be alarmed that the Federal government will begin to dictate teacher licensure standards.

Evaluations of "alternative certification" programs in New Jersey, California and Connecticut indicate they have a measure of success when they are established to accomplish a particular goal--such as attracting persons into inner-city schools. However, The idiosyncratic nature of these programs must be taken into account. Because a particular alternative certification program is useful for attracting individuals into Los Angeles city schools, does not mean it can be successfully replicated elsewhere.

AACTE urges members of the committee to reject the proposal to give state grants to create alternative teacher certification programs. Many colleges and universities already have such programs in place and are serving the needs of non-traditional students. Further, those states, LEAs or IHEs interested in developing such programs may request funding from FIRST which is authorized to make grants for this purpose.

CONTACT: Penelope Earley, Director
Policy Development, Public and Governmental Relations
AACTE
One Dupont Circle, Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036

(202) 293-2450